

tions, on a review of reports on Galveston Harbor, Houston Ship Channel, Texas City Channel, and Galveston Channel, Tex., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 10, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 561); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with six illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FOOTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 238. A bill for the extension of admiralty jurisdiction; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1523). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. House Joint Resolution 242. Joint resolution to direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent for certain land to Joel D. Minor; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1521). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2418. A bill for the relief of Luz Martin; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1522). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 5747. A bill to provide recognition as veterans of the Indian wars for persons who took part in the capture of the Ute Indians in 1906, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 5748. A bill to provide means for financing a United States program of reconstruction in China and to create agencies to carry out such a program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 5749. A bill to provide for a service credit for veterans for the purposes of title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5750. A bill to provide for the extension and improvement of post-office facilities at Los Angeles, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MACK:

H. R. 5751. A bill to extend the coverage of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to the self-employed, employees of nonprofit institutions, and, under voluntary agreements, employees of State and local governments; increase the benefits payable under such system; lower the age requirements for female beneficiaries; and liberalize the eligibility provisions of the system; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MUHLBERG (by request):

H. R. 5752. A bill to amend the Architects' Registration Act for the District of Columbia in order to safeguard life, health, and property, and to promote the public welfare; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

XCIV—149

By Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee:

H. R. 5753. A bill to provide that any veteran who has at any time suffered from service-connected advanced tuberculosis shall receive compensation of not less than \$100 per month for the remainder of his life; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 5754. A bill authorizing a completion of the improvement of the Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. R. 5755. A bill to amend section 14 of the Veterans Preference Act of 1944 (Public Law 359); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 5756. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to authorize an appropriation for the establishment of a geophysical institute at the University of Alaska," approved July 31, 1946 (60 Stat. 750); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 5757. A bill to eliminate the war-tax rates applicable to certain miscellaneous taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POTTER:

H. R. 5758. A bill to amend further the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, to permit certain payments to be made to surviving brothers and sisters and nieces and nephews of deceased members and former members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 5759. A bill to increase all benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 5760. A bill to extend section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 to cover travel of dependents in anticipation of orders of permanent change of station; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 5761. A bill authorizing the transfer of a certain tract of land in the Fort Robinson Military Reservation to the city of Crawford, Nebr., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 5762. A bill relating to custom duties on articles coming into the United States from the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 5763. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public lands in San Juan County, Utah, to the Southwest Indian Mission, Inc.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. Res. 495. Resolution to rescind the citation for contempt against Joseph P. Kamp, vice chairman of the Constitutional Educational League, Inc.; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIAL

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, a memorial was presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Republic of Guatemala, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in protest against sending British warships to Belize; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 5764. A bill for the relief of Eileen Burrell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 5765. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Victor V. Greg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 5766. A bill for the relief of Walter E. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 5767. A bill for the relief of the Sonoma County Farmers' Mutual Fire Insurance Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 5768. A bill for the relief of Clinton E. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 5769. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose A. Mongrain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1504. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Miss Cecelia J. Rowland, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1505. Also, petition of Mrs. Applegate, Lake Worth, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1506. Also, petition of St. Cloud Townsend Club, No. 1, St. Cloud, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1507. Also, petition of George F. Hackett, St. Cloud, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1508. Also, petition of Samuel B. Pryfroyle, of Ohio, and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation for disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1509. Also, petition of A. J. Shundledakar, of Lima, Ohio, and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to support of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1510. Also, petition of Francis J. Reuter, of Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to delinquent high-ranking officers of the Army Air Forces; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1511. Also, petition of Iva O. Smith and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to H. R. 4278; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1512. By Mr. LEWIS: Petition of 44 women who are opposed to the Taft-Wadsworth bill as being unfair to female labor, and who are in favor of equal rights for women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 9, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, February 2, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, to whom all mankind is dear, if we feel frustrated in efforts to

achieve a just and lasting peace, how must Thou feel that men so long and so willfully refuse to heed Thy laws and live in Thy love.

We have found that peace does not come when the guns are silenced, for the war is not really ended.

The job is not done when the fire engines drive away.

So deliver us from the blasphemy of optimism that is mere wishful thinking.

Save us from the delusion of health that we may find the cure for our sickness.

Teach us, O God, that what is needed is not new things, but new spirits.

Give us the uplifted face and the flashing eye that express a purpose in life that will make sacrifice a joy and discipline peace.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 8, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5728) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PROGRAM FOR SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think it should be announced that it is the intention of the leadership to continue the debate on the pending measure and terminate it as quickly as possible. In view of the fact that there have been so many notices of desire to speak and of amendments which are to be offered, I think it is only fair to say to the Members of the Senate that it is the intention, if it shall meet with the approval of the Senate, to hold a session on Saturday, and possibly night sessions Thursday and Friday. I am not stating definitely that there will be a night session Friday, because it depends on the will of the Senate, but I think that, in full cooperation with the program to speed up consideration of the pending bill and with the attempt to terminate its consideration as quickly as possible, I should inform Senators of the possibilities which may arise in the effort.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LANGER obtained the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday, the Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. LANGER. I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to yield to the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri wish to address the Senate?

Mr. KEM. Very briefly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from North Dakota yield for the transaction of routine business first?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment to the pending bill and ask that it lie on the table.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that takes unanimous consent, does it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator repeat his inquiry?

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator to yield because I wish to reserve the right to object. I do not object to the Senator from North Dakota yielding for the insertion of any routine matters in the RECORD, but, because many have attempted to gain the floor through the Senator entitled to the floor yielding, I shall be forced to object to the request of any Senator who asks the Senator from North Dakota to yield for statements or for short speeches, because they usually develop into long speeches.

If the Senator from Maine desires to have the Senator from North Dakota yield for routine business, I have no objection; but if he desires to make a speech, I ask that the request not be made and the time taken from the Senator from North Dakota, but that we adhere to the rules. After the Senator from North Dakota shall have concluded, Senators can present their other matters when they get recognition.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the rules, the Senator from North Dakota can yield only for a question without unanimous consent.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Maine is very happy to cooperate with the Senator from Nebraska and hopes he will continue to be as vigilant as time passes. I am most happy to conform.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. LANGER. I do not yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield, without losing the right to the floor, to the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri, who wishes to say a few words because of the death of the mother of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, surely when a Senator wants merely to introduce a bill or ask for the insertion of matter in the RECORD, objection should not be made. It means delay in the business of the Senate. All I want the floor for is to introduce a bill. If there is no objection, I should like to do that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is obviously bound by the rules, and the rules require that the Senator from North Dakota shall not yield except for a question. At this point, however, the Senator from North Dakota asks unanimous consent that he may yield to the

junior Senator from Missouri to make a brief statement regarding a death in the family of his colleague. Is there objection to that request? The Chair hears none, and the Senator is recognized.

DEATH OF MRS. JOHN CARY DONNELL

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, it is my sad duty to inform the Senate of the death of Mrs. John Cary Donnell, the mother of the senior Senator from Missouri, which occurred today at her home in Kansas City, Mo.

Mrs. Donnell was a native daughter of our State, and the people of Missouri have long had a deep affection for her. They have admired her devotion and helpfulness to her late husband and to her son. They have known her charm, her humanity, and her strong qualities of character and intellect, which they have seen reflected in her distinguished son. Throughout her life Mrs. Donnell maintained a lively interest in governmental affairs, both foreign and domestic, and to the end followed the proceedings of the Congress, and particularly of the Senate, with keen interest and intelligent attention.

Mr. President, I desire to express my sorrow and the sorrow of the people of Missouri at the news of the passing of Mrs. Donnell, and to extend heartfelt sympathy to our colleague.

I ask that the senior Senator from Missouri be excused from attendance on the Senate until next Monday, March 15.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

MEETING OF CIVIL FUNCTIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator from North Dakota yield without losing his place on the floor? I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am forced to ask the Senator from California why he desires to have the Senator yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wish to make a request that the Committee on Appropriations may meet.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Civil Functions of the Committee on Appropriations be permitted to meet during the sessions of the Senate while the civil-functions bill is before it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from North Dakota will be permitted to yield to the Senator from Utah to introduce a bill and to present matters for insertion in the RECORD.

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah introduced a bill and presented matters for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD, which appear elsewhere in the RECORD under their appropriate headings.)

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 125 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Agency for the fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the United States Public Health Service, for the fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF NATIONAL PARK TRUST FUND BOARD

A letter from the Secretary of the National Park Trust Fund Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board for the fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

UNITED STATES V. JOSEPH GROEN ET AL.

A letter from F. Dickinson Letts, Justice, District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report in the case of *United States v. Joseph Groen et al.*, Equity No. 31578 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore and referred as indicated:

A resolution of the Senate of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Resolution 2

"Whereas the Legislature of Puerto Rico passed the Reasonable Rents Act, approved April 25, 1946, which provides control over the rents of dwellings and buildings for commercial and industrial purposes; restriction of ejections to cases which are really justified; and other measures for the protection of tenants during the present emergency;

"Whereas the Puerto Rico Act, as respects the control of rents, follows the same standards as the Federal statute, but is more restrictive than the Housing and Rent Control Act of 1947 as regards proceedings for ejectment, and protects tenants more effectively;

"Whereas the general counsel of the Office of the Housing Expediter in Washington, in an opinion rendered January 5, 1948, gave the following interpretation:

"Section 209 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 places restrictions upon the evictions of tenants. It does not, however, set forth affirmative grounds for the eviction of tenants. In order that a tenant be evicted the landlords must have a cause of action under local law and in addition must comply with the provision of section 209."

"Whereas notwithstanding the interpretation to the contrary given by the Office of the Housing Expediter, the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico in the case of *Avila v. District Court of San Juan*, certiorari No. 1729, held on January 13, 1948, that the causes for

the ejectment of tenants are those fixed by the Housing and Rent Control Act of 1947 and not those fixed by local law, thereby exposing 135,000 tenants living in rented houses in Puerto Rico to unjustified ejectment proceedings;

"Whereas in case the Housing and Rent Control Act of 1947 is extended, it would be most desirable to exclude Puerto Rico from the provisions thereof, inasmuch as on the basis of the interpretation of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico in the aforesaid case of *Avila*, tenants in Puerto Rico do not enjoy the protection contemplated by the Federal act, and, what is worse, also do not enjoy the protection given by the insular act, the provisions of which as regards ejectments, have been declared suspended by the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico while the Federal statute is in force;

"Now, therefore, the Senate of Puerto Rico hereby resolves:

"1. To request of the Congress of the United States that, in case the Housing and Rent Control Act of 1947 is extended, Puerto Rico be excluded from the provisions thereof to the end of ensuring full protection to tenants in Puerto Rico under the provisions of the local laws.

"2. To transmit copies of this resolution to Federal authorities."

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Joint Resolution 29

"Joint resolution approving strengthening the United Nations

"Whereas the General Assembly of Virginia in 1944 passed Senate Joint Resolution No. 19, approving the principle of world federation; and

"Whereas all the world deeply desires durable peace; and

"Whereas the United Nations was created as an instrument to preserve the peace of the world, and

"Whereas experience increasingly indicates that the United Nations, in its present structure, is not fully adequate for this task, and

"Whereas article 109 of the United Nations Charter provides a procedure whereby the Charter of the United Nations may be revised and amended: Now therefore

"Resolved by the house of delegates (the senate concurring), That it is the sense of the General Assembly of Virginia that permanent world peace can and must be achieved through a strengthened United Nations, and to that purpose we believe that action should be taken under the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations to propose and adopt amendments and revisions, including eliminating the veto, that will strengthen the United Nations as an instrument to prevent war and maintain world peace.

"Resolved further, That it is the sense of the General Assembly that the Congress and President of the United States should be requested to urge the calling of a general conference of the United Nations pursuant to article 109 for the purpose of making the United Nations capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing world law to prevent war.

"Resolved further, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, and to the President pro tempore of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Senators and Representatives from Virginia in the Congress.

"RICHMOND, VA., March 8, 1948."

The petition of the St. Cloud (Fla.) Townsend Club No. 1, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a uniform national pension system; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Past Grand Masters Council, No. 94, Grand United Order of Odd Fellows, of Charlotte Amalie, V. I., favoring the enactment of the so-called Crawford bill to return annually to the Virgin Islands the internal-revenue tax collected on goods exported from the Virgin Islands to the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. CAIN, from the Committee on Public Works:

H. R. 3506. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site for a new Federal building in Huntington, W. Va., adjoining existing Federal buildings there, as an economy measure, before land values have increased as a result of improvements; without amendment (Rept. No. 971);

H. R. 4836. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Omaha, Nebr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 972); and

H. R. 4867. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new postal building and for remodeling of the existing main post-office building in Portland, Oreg., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 973).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself and Mr. WATKINS):

S. 2278. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public lands in San Juan County, Utah, to the Southwest Indian Mission, Inc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 2279. A bill to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who were involuntarily separated during the period from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1947, after having rendered 25 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 2280. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the State of Michigan for public-park purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2281. A bill to provide for air parcel-post service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 2282. A bill to make Virginia fire-cured tobacco, comprising type 21, a separate kind of tobacco from other fire-cured tobacco, comprising types 22, 23, and 24; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(Mr. ELLENDER introduced Senate bill 2283, to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to increase the amounts of Federal contributions to the States for old-age assistance and aid to the blind, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

CONTROL AND REGULATION OF BANK HOLDING COMPANIES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUCK submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 829) to provide for control and regulation of bank holding companies, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM— AMENDMENTS

Mr. CAPEHART submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2202) to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2202) to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Subsequently,

Mr. MYERS. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] with reference to the amendment I submitted for him early today to Senate bill 2202, which is now the unfinished business.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WARREN G. MAGNUSON
IN SUBMITTING PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 12 (C) OF THE ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT (S. 2202)

My amendment to S. 2202 relates to the use of surplus agricultural commodities in our foreign-aid program. It is in the nature of a substitute for section 12 (c) appearing on page 22 of the present bill. My amendment, however, retains certain language presently contained in section 12 (c), language which I understand has the particular support of the senior Senator from Kentucky.

This amendment seeks to insure that surplus agricultural commodities will be utilized in our foreign-aid program when the Secretary of Agriculture finds that the supply of the particular commodity is in excess of domestic requirements and the Administrator finds the commodity appropriate for use under the act.

The amendment states that where possible the Administrator shall utilize normal channels of private trade in the procurement of such commodities. I deem this requirement necessary and desirable because as the European recovery plan achieves its objectives, private trade between our businessmen and their former customers in the participating nations should be progressively strengthened. As this program to aid the nations of western Europe achieves success in restoring their economy, a concomitant result will be the progressive substitution of private trade for United States assistance.

The Foreign Relations Committee recognizes this principle in its report on S. 2202. On page 33 the committee states: "Private procurement and normal channels of commerce, trade, and transportation are to be used to the maximum extent practicable."

When the Secretary of Agriculture finds that the supply of a number of commodities is in excess of domestic requirements and the Administrator finds these same commodities appropriate for use under this act, the question arises: "How much of each shall be procured?" My amendment seeks to give the Administrator some guidance in making this decision. It stipulates that in making this decision the Administrator shall ask himself these questions:

"Did the participating countries express a need for these commodities in the reports of the Committee on European Economic Cooperation; and if so, in what amounts?"

"What is the extent of our domestic surplus of each?"

"To what extent historically did growers rely upon markets in the participating countries?"

Let me explain briefly why these questions are pertinent. First, it is clear the needs of the participating countries must be considered; second, while helping others, we can help our own economy most by furnishing the participating countries those commodities which are most plentiful in the United States. I think it justifiable while focusing our eyes on the main objective of this act, to take a look in the rear-view mirror to insure that the assistance we are giving has a minimum impact upon our own economy; third, the bulk of our export trade with European countries—for a time at least—will be carried on under the Economic Cooperation Act now under discussion. Consideration, therefore, must be given to those branches of our agricultural economy which have spent time and money developing markets for their product in the participating countries and who historically have relied upon such markets for the normal movement of their products.

In my judgment, the guide posts which I have just described are sufficiently flexible to avoid tying the hands of the Administrator. They are sufficiently broad to insure consideration of all agricultural commodities, and classes or types thereof, in surplus supply. Yet they avoid the obvious impracticality of trying to force unneeded commodities upon the participating nations.

The last part of my amendment deals with the relationship between price-support programs and foreign aid. Direct purchases of agricultural commodities under the recovery program may not absorb the entire domestic surplus of some farm products. To some extent, therefore, price-support purchases of eligible commodities will no doubt be undertaken by Commodity Credit Corporation. Commodities so purchased will be of value to participating countries and will no doubt be desired for use in the foreign-aid program by the Administrator. Because such commodities will be acquired with domestic price support as a prime objective, but at the same time will be used in our recovery programs, I believe it is appropriate to divide the cost of such commodities between funds appropriated for the two purposes. My amendment, therefore, provides that Commodity Credit Corporation may dispose of appropriate acquisitions to the Administrator at not less than 50 percent of actual cost. This provision is within the framework of S. 2202 and conforms to a principle already tested under the Foreign Aid Act of 1947.

I know that every Senator on the floor is interested in assisting those branches of agriculture confronted with a serious surplus. I think this amendment provides an opportunity for each of my associates to assist in a solution of such problems, insofar as solution is practicable in this Foreign Aid Act.

REDUCTION OF INCOME-TAX PAYMENTS— AMENDMENTS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit two amend-

ments which I intend to propose at the proper time to the bill (H. R. 4790) to reduce individual-income-tax payments, and for other purposes, now pending before the Committee on Finance. I ask that these amendments be printed and referred to that committee, and that they be printed at the appropriate place in the explanatory statement I have prepared, and which I request be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection the amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

The statement presented by Mr. McCARRAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. McCARRAN. It is not my purpose to discuss these amendments at length today; but I do wish to call them to the attention of the Senate, with the hope that Senators may have opportunity to become familiar with them before the tax bill comes to the floor.

One of these two amendments is aimed at correcting the inequities resulting from the fact that our present system of taxing corporate dividends as income is double taxation.

My proposed amendment would deal with this problem of double taxation by allowing a credit to each stockholder in a corporation for his pro rata share of taxes paid by the corporation on its earnings.

This would not involve any complex formula, nor any substantial amount of bookkeeping. So far as the taxpayer is concerned, the bookkeeping involved would be negligible; and all that would be required of a corporation would be to report, to all of its stockholders, the amount of taxes paid and the proportion of the total corporate stock, issued and outstanding, which is represented by one share of stock. The taxpayer could then multiply that percentage by the number of shares he held, and he would know exactly how much of the corporate tax he was allowed to take credit for.

Two principal arguments have been made against this proposal. The first of these arguments is that in some cases the taxpayer might find that the credit to be allowed him for taxes paid by the corporation or corporations in which he held stock was greater than the tax which he would otherwise be required to pay, and that he would therefore be entitled to a refund; and it is argued that there is something terrible about the very thought of any such refunds.

It is also argued that the making of such refunds would be a terribly complicated process. That argument is not credible. The making of such refunds would not be any more complicated than the making of refunds on withholding taxes. But however that may be, if the Government has collected taxes from any citizen in excess of the taxes to which the Government is entitled, there should be a refund; it is neither honest nor plausible to argue that a refund to which a taxpayer is entitled should be withheld just because it would cost the Government a certain amount of effort to return what it took improperly.

More than half of all the dividends received in the United States are received by people whose total incomes are less than \$5,000 per year. Many of these people live wholly, or almost entirely, on dividends. With the dollar shrunken in buying power, as it is today, many of these people are having great trouble making ends meet. My amendment to eliminate double tax-

tion would give these people immediate and effective relief, and relief to which, in equity, they clearly are entitled.

(The amendment dealing with the problem of double taxation submitted by Mr. McCARRAN is as follows:)

"At the proper place in the bill, insert the following:

"ELIMINATION OF DOUBLE TAXATION

"SEC. . Section 23 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is further amended by renumbering the matter now contained therein as clause (1) and by adding thereto a new paragraph as follows:

"(2) The deduction for taxes allowed by subsection (c) shall be allowed to a stockholder of a corporation in the case of taxes imposed upon the earnings of the corporation and paid by the corporation: *Provided*, That such allowance in no case shall exceed that proportion of such taxes bearing the same ratio to the total taxes so imposed and paid as the shares of stock owned by the stockholder bear to the total corporate stock issued and outstanding."

Mr. McCARRAN. The second amendment which I have proposed to the pending tax bill is designed to permit, and to encourage, the plowing back of business profits into increased production, through the expansion, improvement, and modernization of plant facilities.

(The second amendment submitted by Mr. McCARRAN is as follows:)

"At the proper place in the bill insert the following:

"BUSINESS PROFITS FOR EXPANSION

"SEC. . Section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductions from gross income) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection to read as follows:

"(bb) Capital Expenditures for Trade or Business.—At the election of a taxpayer, all expenditures (subject to limitations prescribed below) paid or incurred during the taxable year for the acquisition, construction, or improvement of any real or personal property to be used in a trade or business. Total deductions under this subsection in any 1 year shall not exceed \$125,000 or 50 percent of the taxpayer's net income as computed without the benefits of this subsection, whichever is the lesser. If in any year expenditures deductible under this subsection are less than the total of such expenditures, the balance may be added to the expenditures of the immediately succeeding year and be considered for the purposes of this subsection as having been made in such immediately succeeding year. Such expenditures shall be allowable as deductions only under rules and regulations prescribed by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary."

"SEC. . Section 24 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to items not deductible from gross income) is hereby amended to read as follows: "Any amount paid out for new buildings or for permanent improvements or betterments made to increase the value of any property or estate, except as provided in section 23 (bb);"

"SEC. . Section 113 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to adjusted basis for property) is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (H), and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and by adding after subparagraph (H) a new subparagraph to read as follows:

"(I) for expenditures deducted under the provisions of section 23 (bb)."

"SEC. . The amendments made by sections —, —, and of this act shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947."

Mr. McCARRAN. The centralization of industrial power in the United States is growing yearly. One of the factors working

toward a constantly greater and greater centralization is the inability of small business to grow in the traditional American fashion.

In a capitalistic democracy such as ours, it is vitally important to have a constant infusion of new blood at the bottom of the business ladder, in all fields of endeavors; and to give those who start new enterprises every reasonable opportunity and inducement to grow.

Our present tax structure does not provide such opportunity and such inducement.

The profits from a business, which the proprietor invests in new plant, machinery, or equipment, to increase his production, are taxed just like any other profits. Such expenditures are not deductible expenses in the year in which made. They have to be capitalized, and then the capital expenditure must be amortized over a period of years.

The amendment which I have proposed would permit capital expenditures, within certain limitations, to be allowed as a deduction in computing taxable income.

To put it another way, this proposal amounts to 100 percent depreciation on capital expenditures, within certain limits.

The amendment suggests a limitation of not exceeding \$125,000, or 50 percent of the taxpayer's net income, whichever is the lesser, in any given year.

Perhaps this figure is too high, though I have heard many contend that it is too low. I am particularly interested in helping small business; and if it should be the judgment of the Senate that this dollar limitation should be reduced, I would be content, provided the limit should not, in an excess of caution, be set too low. I do not believe it should go, in any case, below \$50,000 as the maximum limit. Many small businesses would be greatly helped by the opportunity to make even that much of an expenditure, for expansion or plant improvements, on a tax deductible basis. But with costs in all lines as high as they are today, the maximum limitation should be set higher than this in order to provide the maximum relief and the maximum benefit.

We still have in this country today an excess of demand over supply in many fields, including still many items of consumer goods. General tax relief will only increase that demand, without doing anything to increase the supply. This amendment which I have proposed would do something about increasing the supply, since it would provide incentive for expanded production.

This proposal would afford particularly effective relief to the small, unincorporated businessman. The present tax rate for corporations ranges from 21 percent to 38 percent, with profits below \$50,000, and rests at 38 percent where profits are larger. But the small-business-man who is unincorporated runs head-on into an even greater tax barrier, because under the present law a small-business man with an income of \$50,000 pays out more than 50 percent of his income in taxes. Under those conditions, it is almost impossible for a man to build a business.

Big business has the financial contacts—the contacts with banks, with underwriters, with large investors—to borrow the money it needs for expansion. In many cases a small-business man has only one source of money—the profits on his business.

This country needs small business. It needs small business that has a chance to grow and play a real part in our economy. But small business cannot grow unless it has the money to finance expansion. And even if a small-business man is able to get the capital he needs from outside his business, he often runs the risk, in getting it, of losing control of his business to outsiders, or, more particularly, to his big-business competitors.

My proposed amendment would give him an opportunity to plow back into the expan-

sion of his business some of the profits from that business.

Taxes that reduce the funds available for plowing back into a small business handicap the growth of small business in general, and continue to assist big business in retaining its superior position.

It is apparent that if this amendment is adopted there will be a reduction in tax revenues, in proportion to the increase in capital investments, for expansion and increased production which would be brought about.

It must be remembered, however, that what is proposed here is simply a taking of depreciation all at once, and that no further deductions for the same depreciation will be allowed in future years. Tax collections, therefore, will tend to even out, and in the long run it is hard to see how the Government would lose any money. In fact, I anticipate that the gains in taxable production, through the stimulation of business which this measure would bring about, will yield a substantially increased tax revenue in future years.

The important fact to remember is this: Whatever this proposal would cost the Government in anticipated tax revenue would necessarily be only a fraction of the amount by which it would increase capital expenditures, for expansion of business, and for increased production. I count that one of the strongest possible arguments in favor of the proposal.

I have received many letters about this proposal, from all over the country, since I first offered it as a proposed amendment to the tax bill which was considered at the last session of the Congress.

One of those letters was from Mr. Bernard M. Baruch. I quoted from Mr. Baruch's letter when I addressed the Senate on this proposal last year. Let me quote from it again, in closing. Mr. Baruch wrote: "I just want to say that the general purpose of your plan is good. I would rather do something of this kind than to reduce taxes in any other form."

Referring to the effect of the present tax situation on unincorporated small business, Mr. Baruch wrote:

"No unincorporated business can get ahead. It is bad enough for a small incorporated business. That is the quarrel I had as regards the previous tax reduction—that the corporations got the benefit, placing the individual at a greater disadvantage than ever."

Mr. Baruch, of course, does not favor any tax reduction at this time; but I think it is significant that, even though he holds that view, Mr. Baruch wrote, in his letter to me that—

"Such a plan as yours will stimulate business, thus stimulating volume and bringing our economy more into balance."

That is one of the strongest arguments for this amendment which can be made.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5728) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ADDRESS BY MRS. PEARL S. BUCK AT
GANDHI MEMORIAL

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Mrs. Pearl S. Buck at the Gandhi memorial held in Washington on February 11, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONDITIONS IN SPAIN—ARTICLE BY
FRANK C. WALDROP

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled

"Spain?" by Frank C. Waldrop, from the Washington Times-Herald of March 9, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO ON PLACING A WREATH ON THE JOHN ERICSSON STATUE

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address delivered by him on the occasion of placing a wreath on the John Ericsson statue, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HERMAN E. MOORE TO BE JUDGE, DISTRICT COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, March 16, 1948, at 10 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Herman E. Moore, of Illinois, to be judge of the District Court of the Virgin Islands of the United States. Judge Moore is now serving in this post under an appointment which expired February 10, 1948. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], chairman; the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE]; and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2202) to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, yesterday I was discussing the question of displaced persons, and the connection that has with the Marshall plan.

I am sure every Senator will be interested in an article which appeared in the Legislative Bulletin, of which John Thomas Taylor is the Director, a publication issued by the American Legion.

Mr. President, there is on the statute books a lobby law, and one who comes to Washington to advocate a bill pending in Congress must register. I am sure all Senators will be interested in knowing how many are registered as lobbyists in behalf of the displaced persons bill.

I read from the Legislative Bulletin, to which I have just referred:

In addition to numerous organizations registered with the Senate and House of Representatives who are working in behalf of the admission of displaced persons, either by relaxing immigration quotas or otherwise, during the past quarter the following persons have been registered with Congress as legislative representatives of the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons.

In other words, Mr. President, for this one committee, the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, the following persons are registered, and I shall state their

salaries as they appear in the records of the Senate and the House of Representatives:

Name	Annual salary
James M. Kiernan.....	\$15,000
Thomas M. Cooley.....	12,000
Leo J. Margolin.....	12,000
Jack Wasserman.....	12,000
Vinton E. Ziegler.....	8,000
William S. Bernard.....	7,500
Curtis Edward Johnson.....	7,500
Myron Ray Ely.....	6,000
Robert W. Pearson.....	6,000
Helen Alcott Shuford.....	6,000
Clara Leiser.....	5,220
Pearl Richardson.....	5,220
Peggy Harris.....	5,220
John T. D. Franzen.....	5,040
Eric Kocher.....	5,040
Blossom Steinart.....	5,040
Beatrice Wellington.....	5,040
McCreith Selby.....	4,800
Elizabeth Buck.....	4,320
Patricia Ritter.....	4,080
Elizabeth Gardiner.....	4,020
Charlotte E. Abbott.....	4,000
Harry L. Bennett, Jr.....	3,000
Total.....	152,020

Mr. President, a total of \$152,020 is paid to these lobbyists by one organization, the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. But that is not all. I continue to read from the Legislative Bulletin:

In addition to salaries, these people also receive "actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses," which includes such items as air and railroad fares, hotels, meals, telegraph, telephone, and postage. As they are operating from two different addresses in New York City, which no doubt requires much traveling to Washington in connection with their lobbying activities, these expenses are no doubt very extensive.

That is a statement which also appears, Mr. President, in the Legislative Bulletin of the American Legion. So we have the spectacle that the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons has hired lobbyists who are paid \$152,020 in order to lobby a bill through the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I submit that these are not all the lobbyists we have, because other organizations, aside from the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, also have representatives in Washington. Last evening I read an article in the Washington Evening Star, by Joseph Young, entitled "Federal Leave System Abuse Needs Change, BRIDGES and BALL Say."

I wish to say in connection with the article that I was delighted and very happy indeed to note in it that some Senators have at last awakened to the fact that Federal employees are human, that they are not machines or robots; nor men and women, boys and girls, working under a narcotic influence which prevents them from becoming ill, sick, or tired.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks the article by Mr. Young may be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 8, 1948]

FEDERAL LEAVE SYSTEM ABUSE NEEDS CHANGE, BRIDGES AND BALL SAY

(By Joseph Young)

A sharp attack on the Government's sick- and annual-leave system was made today by Chairman BRIDGES, of the Senate Appropriations Committee, as he called on Congress to review the entire Federal leave system.

Senator BALL, Republican, of Minnesota, who headed a Senate appropriations subcommittee which conducted a study of Federal employees' leave privileges, joined with Senator BRIDGES in asking that the whole system be reviewed "with a view to eliminating abuses and tightening up what may be a too-liberal leave system."

The subcommittee study showed "a widespread abuse of sick-leave privileges" among Federal employees, the Senators declared.

CALLED HIDDEN OBLIGATION

"Sick and annual leave constitute an extremely sizable financial obligation of the Federal Government and, in a sense, one of the hidden appropriations in the total that make up the budget for each fiscal year," the Senators declared.

They said that more than 73 percent of all Government employees use sick-leave privileges during the 9-month period in which the study was made. In some agencies the average was close to 100 percent, Senator BRIDGES declared.

The subcommittee's report declared "many departments and agencies, the larger ones particularly, report frequent abuse of the privilege. Most frequent among these were absences immediately preceding or immediately subsequent to a week end, absences for longer periods than are actually required for medical, dental, or optical treatment, and absences when a reduction-in-force order is about to be effected."

Government employees are allowed 26 days' vacation each year and 15 days of sick leave, if necessary.

PRIVATE WORK COMPARED

Turning to annual-leave provisions, the subcommittee's report stated that, in comparison with private industry, the Government is unique in the amount of leave benefits it grants its employees.

The total sick- and annual-leave accumulations in the Government represent a potential obligation of \$1,100,000,000, the report declared, referring to the fact that when Federal employees leave the service they are entitled to cash payments for their unused leave privileges.

Senator BRIDGES said that Federal employees who availed themselves of all their leave privileges worked only 212 days a year, or only 58 percent of the time.

AVAILABILITY POWERFUL LURE

He cited the remark made by a bureau head to one of the committee's investigators, in which the official declared:

"As long as sick leave is available, most employees will use it upon the slightest malaise."

Most frequent abuses of sick-leave privileges are noncareer employees, especially those whose work is monotonous or distasteful, the report asserted.

In an effort to eliminate abuses of sick-leave privileges, the Civil Service Commission recently gave Federal agencies the power to require doctors' certificates from employees who utilize them.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, during the long years of the war, long, long, tedious hours, from early in the morning until late at night, the patriotic

efforts of our Federal employees continued unabated. Possibly they were exceeded in their zeal only by the railroad workers, who with their younger men in the armed forces, with 21 per cent less employees than they had had before the war commenced, moved twice as much freight and did twice as much work, with twice as much profit to the railroads. One of the great sagas of the war was the work done by the railroad employees.

It is indeed refreshing to note that the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and his associate, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, have conducted a study of Federal employees' leave privileges. From the newspaper account, I note they studied only for a 9-month period. Now, I do not know just what 9 months they were, but I am satisfied that, if they will investigate, they will find that those in the higher brackets—commencing about \$10,000 a year—leave Washington for a 3-month vacation. It may be a judge, tired—very, very tired and worn out from his arduous duties. In North Dakota there was a Federal judge who not only went to the lakes in the summertime, but went to Florida in the wintertime. Apparently he worked so hard during 5 or 6 months that he was obliged to go away both during the summer and the winter. It may be a Member of the Senate, who after working hard from January until July must leave the disagreeable climate of Washington during July, August, and September to regain his health, possibly, or to find out how things are going in Greece, Germany, Austria, Iran, or South America. And I remember one Senator well who used to investigate Yellowstone National Park regularly every summer—in fact, he had a suite of rooms assigned to him at the hotel near Old Faithful.

Rarely, Mr. President, have I seen such trembling solicitude for Federal employees as we find here in the Senate at the present time, when we are voting five or six billions of dollars to foreign countries and are anxious to see that at the same time we take care of our own employees who had not had a pay raise until 1945. Of course, when they got that pay raise, an Executive order promptly took away overtime so that, with the income tax, the employees got less than they got before. Just think of it—Government employees are allowed 26 days' vacation each year and 15 days of sick leave, if necessary. Of course, it is not as much as they get in Russia, but then Russia is a barbarous country. I mention Russia because it is asserted that the Marshall plan is necessary to be adopted in order to stave off communism. In Russia the Government gives them 30 days, buys them a ticket, sends them off to a nice fresh-water lake with all members of their families. All their expenses are paid while they are at the lake, and they get their ticket back home.

There are thousands of GI's who went out to fight for their country, who receive but \$1,900 a year as mail handlers,

for example, in the post office department. If they work real hard they will get a raise of \$100 the next year. But when they get to the point where they are paid \$2,500 they receive no further increase. As mail handlers, or in similar jobs, they must work those 41 days additional to keep body and soul together. Testimony before the subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shows that hundreds of these men work after hours, at night, because they cannot possibly live on \$1,900 a year with the cost of living what it is at the present time.

It is said that the total sick and annual leave accumulations in the Federal Government represent a potential obligation of \$1,100,000,000. Worse yet, when Federal employees leave the service they are entitled to cash payments for their unused leave privileges. In just a moment I will come back to the question of cash payments for unused leave privileges.

There are 52 Sundays and 52 Saturdays in 1 year. That makes a total of 104 days. There are 8 holidays, which added to the 104 days, make a total of 112 days. There are 365 days in 1 year, and when we subtract 112 we have left 253 days. If we deduct 26 days of vacation, we have 227 days left, and when we take off 15 days sick leave, we have 212 days left. It is just as simple as that.

Of course, it must be understood that these Federal employees are not regular citizens. For example, no matter how bad conditions become, they have no right to strike. They have no right to take part in politics. If they want to better their conditions by getting together politically, they automatically lose their jobs. In addition, a man or woman who has put in 25 or 30 years of his life may go to work some morning to find that he has no job, because some GI or WAC, under veterans' preference, has come in during the night and taken his desk, even though the Government employee has a 100 percent efficiency rating and has civil service status. That happens to men and women who have worked 25 or 26 years for the Government, who have a 100 percent efficiency rating, who have rendered good service, and who have an excellent status. No one wants to employ women who are 51 or 52 years old. Employers would rather have a girl of 19, 23, or 24. A Government employee may be thrown out of a job overnight because some WAC or GI, under veterans' preference, has a right to take that job away from him, no matter how efficient he has been. No matter how honest or patriotic he has been, he is out. That is the law which the Congress of the United States has enacted.

I wonder how many Senators would be inclined to take sick leave if tomorrow some young man or woman could walk in and say, "Mr. Senator, I have preference. You are out and I am in."

We now have a situation in which Government employees take more sick leave than they did before. Because of the war, when hours meant nothing to them, they are tired. Some of them have not yet recovered from the long hours they worked patriotically for our Government.

Also, of course, the average age is higher. They are 5 or 6 years older than they were when the war started. So they take a little more sick leave than they used to take.

As a rule young folks will not take Government jobs if they can possibly avoid it. As chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I would say to any young man or woman, "You are smart not to take a Government job, because at the present time there is very little future in a Government job."

It seems that nearly everyone hounds the Government employee. For example, take a person working in the post office. I have the records here. I wrote to every single postmaster in the United States. I sent 42,000 of them each a letter. I wanted to find out the working conditions. I wanted to find out about their equipment. I have the replies in my office. I have copies of some of them before me.

Sometimes post-office workers must work with the snow blowing in the window because there is no glass in the window. Sometimes post-office workers must work with so much water on the floor that they are required to wear overshoes. Others have to work with typewriters more than 30 years old. Some work with complicated machines which they must borrow. If any Senator is interested, I have the names of these people.

As chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service I can assure every Senator, from first-hand knowledge and correspondence, that postmasters are pleading for some of the most rudimentary equipment with which to transact the business of the Post Office Department.

Come with me to a little city of 3,500 people in Minnesota, and see the 7-foot-long board which is the post-office desk, counter, or whatever one chooses to call it. Across this board the postmaster and his assistants sell \$25,000 worth of stamps every year, as well as conduct \$75,000 worth of general business, including money orders, postal savings, and the like. Yet we indulge in international double-talk, and tell how much we must spend, and how much we want to pay, for other nations to enjoy. If I do not mistake the signs, we have almost become a "have not" Nation. Certainly we have not attempted to put our domestic house in order.

Here is a town in Pennsylvania whose post office needed a safe in which to keep valuables. The safe was not supplied by the Government. The Government would not buy a safe. The safe was supplied by a citizen. The doors of that post office were so flimsy that a strong wind, not a storm, might blow them apart. They hung loosely on their hinges.

In a second-class post office at Fairbury, Ill.—I might as well give the names of these places, so that if any Senator wishes to make an investigation he can do so—the postmaster reports:

Our most urgent need is a safe room for the protection of valuables and stamp stock, with sales drawers to maintain individual responsibility.

Have Senators ever visited Beaver Dam, Wis., where Postmaster John L. Cunningham makes the following statement?

We are badly in need of a parcel-post desk in our post-office lobby. You can see from the enclosed picture that parcel post has to be lifted and pushed through a 17 by 24-inch opening. If anything larger than 17 by 24 inches is presented, the window clerk has to crawl under the counter and open a small door to take in the package. Our building is 30 years old, and there has never been any change in the original screen-line installation. Our receipts this year will run about \$130,000, and since the express company raised its rates we get a great volume of parcel post. The window clerks are not permitted to paste stamps on patrons' parcels, so they have to have large parcels rated up and then take them away from the window, put on stamps, then get back in line to present them. Our window is 48 inches from the floor. You can see from the picture that the women at the window cannot paste stamps on a large package without taking it away.

Can it be that the material for this equipment has already gone to Europe?

Let us look at the situation in Westford, Mass., where Henrietta R. McNiff is acting postmaster. This lady says:

We are badly in need of all equipment, as the only things we have here are a few odds and ends picked up to make it possible to carry on. In general, everything here is obsolete and in need of repairs. We most certainly could use a new outfit in general for this office.

Mr. President, in order to make the survey geographically more complete, I now turn to Saguache, Colo., where Mrs. Esta M. Fuson is postmaster. She makes this statement:

Our equipment is roughly made as to tables, etc. The canceling machine, typewriter, and adding machine are old, but I can't afford to replace them. The office itself is a disgrace to the Department. It is filthy, dirty as to walls, some of the plaster has fallen. In spots the lighting is dangerous, as it is merely dropped cords hung from one double socket to another and is a fire hazard. The Department has sent in an inspector several times to check on the conditions of the office. They all agree something should be done but nothing happens. And after 7 years of working in such unsightly surroundings.

Now let us turn to Connecticut, where the postmaster at Poquonock declares:

When I took over this office in June 1946 I had to buy the post boxes, which according to hearsay are 100 years old. I also had to buy a stove, safe, desk, and two chairs, besides other equipment. The Department refused me a sorting case, therefore I had to build one at my own expense and at my own time. We have no filing cabinets, typewriter, calculator, or many other things that would make this a modern office.

Can it be, Mr. President, that we have sent all our available typewriters, calculators, filing cabinets, lockers, and sorting cases, as well as lock boxes, to some other nations, along with our money, and at the same time find that it is necessary to curtail our governmental expenditures, so that we do not even leave ourselves the money with which to buy such necessities, even if they were available?

Let us look at Bridgehampton, N. Y., where Marjorie Dickinson is postmaster.

This is a second-class post office. Miss Dickinson reports as follows:

There are no cabinets or cupboards for keeping permanent records; they are piled in card boxes in the cellar covered with ashes and dust and being chewed up by mice.

Those are Government records which the United States at almost any time may be called upon to produce in the case of claims or other instances which can easily cost the Government money. Yet rats and mice are making their private recovery program out of such records.

If there are Members of the Senate who have not visited a third-class post office, I would have them go with me to Gardendale, Ala., and talk to the postmaster there, and they will learn what I have already learned, which is reported as follows:

For years an unattractive and unpainted shack has been the only representative of the United States Government in our community. If there isn't enough funds to carry out the program, permit me to thank you again for your letter. It did my heart good and I received your letter in a most appreciative manner.

In the same State of Alabama, at Hacklebury, we shall be greeted by Fannie K. Frederick, the postmaster, who states:

More than anything else, we need a decent post-office building. The one we are now occupying is shameful. It once was wrecked by a storm and is in very bad condition. The owner refuses to repair it unless the Post Office Department will pay more rent. Anything Congress can do will be appreciated and remembered by us.

I have before me other communications from post offices in Alabama, including one from Mobile, and I have one from Aberdeen, Idaho, and so forth.

Here is one from Georgia. The postmaster at Milan, Ga., says:

The roof has leaked for the past several years, so that the employees are forced to wear overshoes when it rains.

That is the condition in that post office of the United States Government. When it rains there, the roof leaks, and all the help has to put on overshoes.

I read further:

It has leaked for so many years that it has caused the overhead wood framing to damage and sway down, making it very unsafe for the public and the postal employees. The windows and doors are so badly misfitted with cracks on the floor that it is impossible to keep the office force comfortable in the winter. I feel that upon inspection the building would be condemned as unsafe and a health menace, as attested by the number of cases of Brill's fever among the employees.

Mr. President, when an employee of the Federal Government gets Brill's fever because of roof leaks and because the water comes down through the roof, forcing the employees to put on overshoes, but finally they become sick, then I maintain that 15 days a year of sick leave is not enough.

At Niagara, Wis.—and this is not a third-class or fourth-class post office, but it is a second-class post office—the acting postmaster declares:

The thing we need here mostly is a new post office. The antiquated shack that we

are conducting business in is an eyesore to the community. Not only that, but we are constantly wondering if the roof is going to fall in, or the floor drop from beneath our feet.

At Russellton, Va., Delia Saloman, postmaster, declares she has 400 lock boxes rented and that "the task of replacing them is more than I can afford." She adds that:

In my 13 years of service, I have practically worn out my typewriter and could use a new one, since there are phases of the work that must be done by typewriter. I have one small filing cabinet for current business, but no place for old records. A new filing cabinet and adding machine would be a time saver but is not a necessity.

At Annandale, N. J., Mr. Cecil R. McConnell is postmaster. Mr. McConnell reports that:

We could use just about everything and anything. A great need, as I see it, is a safe, as the last one I provided was badly damaged when this post office was robbed the night of December 20, 1940. I have since kept a book of this office's postage-stamp stock and valuables in my home and cart most of the rest of the stock in valuables to and from my home nights and mornings, this being the best sort of protection I am able to afford.

He further says:

I also would like to point out that our post-office building's present condition is inadequate for postal service, with no toilet facilities and no heating plant, necessitating our relying upon oil burners because of high ceilings and no insulation against the weather. The post-office building needs, among other things, repainting inside and out, as it has not been painted since I received my postmaster appointment back in 1935. Contributing my services, I have once painted the interior of the post-office building myself while I was postmaster under the late Woodrow Wilson. All secure fastenings on the doors of the post-office building, a plain structure, and a different lock on the front door are among other needs.

I mention all these different States, Mr. President, so that the situation may be shown to be the same all over the country. This one is from Texas. The acting postmaster, Grace G. Sandelin, of Flatwood, Tex., reports:

I have 131 lock boxes. All of them with the exception of 6 are extremely old and out of date. They are so old I cannot get parts to repair them. I really need to have them replaced with new ones and could use 25 more if I had them. I have 3 chairs in the office. One of them is a fairly nice swivel chair, but the other two are old and really worn out. I could also use a large locker to keep my records in, thus eliminating the mice getting at them.

We now go to California. At Riverdale in that State the acting postmaster there is Mr. D. B. Dadasci. He says:

The adding machine we are using is borrowed from one of the postoffice clerks, who would like very much to have it back. It is of a very ancient vintage. The serviceman for the Burroughs Adding Machine Co. says it is one of the oldest machines in use.

The Burroughs Adding Machine Co. began business a little over 50 years ago.

The second-class postoffice at Downs-ville, La., reports through its postmaster, Mr. T. Oliver Thibadeau, as follows:

At the end of every quarter and often at the end of the month I have had to resort to

borrowing a machine from a department store, a parish house, and so forth, wherever a machine is available.

Mr. President, I have taken the time briefly to look at the progress of the rural electrification program, particularly in my own State of North Dakota. I find that conductors, poles, and wire, and almost every other material going into the lines has been slow in coming through. Mr. Ted V. Byzewski, of Marvel, N. Dak., still gropes around his farm in the darkness, unable to get kerosene or gasoline, and of course his most menial chores have to be done by hand. America still is not lighted up.

From Ashley, N. Dak., Mr. Theophil Haas writes:

I wish to say that if you Senators would live on a farm the way we people do, you would see that the service of REA is urgently needed; indeed, it is very urgently needed. The farmer is the man who feeds the world. We farmers would be willing to pay a price for this service if we could only obtain it. The 32-volt plants are good for light and for a few quarter-horsepower motors, but they don't seem to hold out.

It is apparent that while Russia and other nations are going forward headlong into high-tension electrical programs, America is still dragging its feet.

Here is a letter from Gideon Oldenburger, of Napoleon, N. Dak.:

I think the farmer's wife would say it was a godsend if she could have running water, refrigeration, and many other things that are too numerous to mention. I and other farmers here in North Dakota wish to take this opportunity to thank you for doing your best to get our State electrified.

The electrification program throughout the United States is still far behind. The other day I gave certain figures relating to rural electrification. As I said then, before the war, 95 farmers out of every hundred in Japan had light and power, and 95 out of every 100 had light and power in Germany, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. In America, but one State, the State of Rhode Island, had attained a percentage of 95 when the report was published 2 years ago. The State of Washington, from which my distinguished colleague [Mr. CAIN] comes, is 85 percent electrified. In the great State of Washington a remarkable piece of work was done, because the bill of the average farmer in that State is \$1.50 a month, something entirely beyond the conception of farmers in so many other States, as for example, Montana, where 25 out of every 100 farmers have light and power, or Minnesota, where 40 out of every 100 have light and power, or North Dakota, where 7 out of every 100 have light and power, or South Dakota, where 9 out of every 100 have light and power, and where the bills run from five to six or seven dollars a month. In the State of Washington the average monthly bill is \$1.50. So I say, we have a situation that affects not merely post offices. But I care not what governmental agency is mentioned, there is a need of money, money, and more money, in order to take care of our own people. We talk about keeping communism out of Germany and other countries. I suggest it would be a good thing for the Senate to see that we do not let com-

munist enter America, provided the men who want to stop its spread so badly are really concerned about it.

Let me cite a few figures. A few days ago Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, issued a release to the press, in which he said:

We need \$75,000,000,000 for a 15-year program for Federal roads and buildings alone.

That is \$5,000,000,000 a year.

A few days ago in the House of Representatives, Representative KEEFE, chairman of a subcommittee dealing with matters of public health, announced that \$8,000,000,000 was needed in order to protect the public health. I remember that during the war more than 600,000 boys were refused admission into the Army because of physical defects or because of a lack of education. So, for public-health purposes \$8,000,000,000 is needed over a period of 5 years.

Mr. President, I have here a report made by a subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. The report makes it clear that if the proposal to reduce the budget is to be carried out, there must be a cut of 25 percent of the increase of \$1,500,000,000 a year in the pay of Federal employees.

What about veterans? My mail is filled with communications from veterans. They are not receiving sufficient money when disabled. I do not know what the cost will be over the next 5 years, but of one thing I am certain, that is, that it will be very materially increased as the money is set aside for educational purposes. Certainly an increase of \$7,000,000,000 is bound to come, and that within a very short time.

Then we come to Federal aid for schools. I have here a table bearing on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that the table be inserted in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

State	Expenditure per pupil in public elementary and secondary schools for 1944-45	Estimated per pupil expenditure with proposed Federal aid ¹
United States average.....	\$125.00	\$140.42
Alabama.....	56.93	93.57
Arizona.....	127.55	146.69
Arkansas.....	60.26	99.50
California.....	163.38	169.83
Colorado.....	129.47	136.66
Connecticut.....	159.50	167.11
Delaware.....	133.05	140.92
District of Columbia.....	161.02	170.28
Florida.....	94.55	101.55
Georgia.....	64.92	97.39
Idaho.....	112.34	123.20
Illinois.....	109.32	177.20
Indiana.....	131.29	138.11
Iowa.....	124.83	131.32
Kansas.....	130.85	137.09
Kentucky.....	80.94	119.74
Louisiana.....	95.31	125.49
Maine.....	97.75	105.81
Maryland.....	113.98	122.52
Massachusetts.....	166.67	174.76
Michigan.....	127.73	134.69
Minnesota.....	144.29	161.43
Mississippi.....	44.80	82.66
Missouri.....	113.07	120.60
Montana.....	163.42	170.35
Nebraska.....	127.28	134.00

¹ Does not include any increases in local and State expenditures for the years 1944-45 through 1947-48.

State	Expenditure per pupil in public elementary and secondary schools for 1944-45	Estimated per pupil expenditure with proposed Federal aid
Nevada.....	\$155.88	\$162.91
New Hampshire.....	131.48	142.59
New Jersey.....	198.33	205.89
New Mexico.....	119.98	155.89
New York.....	194.47	202.14
North Carolina.....	68.91	100.92
North Dakota.....	132.55	148.97
Ohio.....	138.25	145.29
Oklahoma.....	96.61	120.74
Oregon.....	144.56	150.94
Pennsylvania.....	137.00	144.70
Rhode Island.....	148.96	157.93
South Carolina.....	65.17	103.44
South Dakota.....	144.62	159.43
Tennessee.....	69.70	98.71
Texas.....	102.46	120.89
Utah.....	120.24	132.78
Vermont.....	117.90	130.34
Virginia.....	83.49	100.76
Washington.....	159.78	165.99
West Virginia.....	93.18	121.82
Wisconsin.....	140.41	148.06
Wyoming.....	164.84	171.63

Mr. LANGER. The table shows exactly how much money each State of the Union will need in order that its children may obtain even a minimum education. Certainly if there is any class of people underpaid today it is the school teachers of the United States.

Mr. President, we come now to Federal housing. No one seems to know how much that is going to cost. Certainly it is badly needed. Housing bills have been pending in Congress for a very long time. I noticed in one newspaper it was estimated the amount ought to be \$8,000,000,000 for the next 3 years.

Then of course we come to universal military training. If there is any vote of which I am proud, it is the vote I cast against the adoption of the United Nations Charter. It is now 2 years since former Senator Shipstead and I voted against that measure. After we, together with men such as former Senator Wheeler, pleaded and pleaded, some of the Senators now upon this floor afterwards voted for the bill. I wish to refresh the memory of Senators by re-reading a portion of what I said when I voted against adoption of the United Nations Charter.

I said on the 28th day of July 1945:

Mr. President, during my service in the Senate in behalf of the common people, I have never sold the truth to serve the hour. I have no quarrel with the vote of any honest Senator upon this floor. Each one took the same oath that I took, namely, to defend and uphold the Constitution of the United States of America.

Practically all Members of this body have indicated that they will vote for the Charter. Under my oath, Mr. President, and under my conscience, I cannot so vote. If I did I would feel that I was betraying the hundreds of thousands who have died in this war for the United States, and the hundreds of thousands who have sacrificed their loved ones and their treasure. I would be willing to vote for the appropriation of the last dollar in the United States Treasury, and the last dollar that we could borrow if, by spending that money, we could eliminate war, which we all abhor and hate. I would unhesitatingly vote for the Charter if I felt that it offered even the tiniest hope of a permanent peace. But, in spite of that, Mr. President, I feel from the bottom of my heart that the adoption of the Charter—and, make sure, we are going to implement

it—will mean perpetuating war. I feel that it will mean the enslavement of millions of people from Poland to India, from Korea to Java, as well as people in many other places on this earth.

Who would have believed, Mr. President, that a President of the United States could affix his signature to an agreement that provided for the enslaving of millions of human beings? There they are today, Mr. President—hundreds of thousands of slaves in some places and millions in others, brought to that condition by the signatures of three men; and this in the twentieth century of civilization.

I read further:

Mr. President, I feel that the adoption of the Charter will be one step more toward compulsory and military conscription, and all that which goes with war.

A few days ago I called before a subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service a high-ranking Army officer who stated that in Knoxville, Tenn., there has been operating for a year and a half a military college which already has had 1,800 graduates, young men who have taken military training. The authorities are not satisfied with that. They want military training in all the schools of the United States. They are begging young boys to leave school in my State. I put into evidence one of the pamphlets sent to the normal school in Ellendale, N. Dak., in which boys were urged to leave the normal school and go to Nashville, Tenn., to take military training, because it is so nice. On inquiry as to who had ordered it, it was said that it was done at the order of General Eisenhower, and that he had established the school in Tennessee.

I said at the time the United Nations Charter was adopted, Mr. President, that I felt that its adoption would be one step more toward compulsory military conscription and of all that goes with it. I can only say today that I was a good prophet. What will it cost? The figures range all the way from \$2,000,000 a year to \$6,000,000,000 a year. We shall have universal military training. We shall not have money for education, for health, and for some of the other things which I have mentioned.

I continued in my speech, Mr. President, as follows:

In my opinion, the charter is not at all similar to the Constitution of the United States which was adopted by the Original Colonies. I may say at this point that I agree with what the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] said earlier in the day, when he stated:

"Most important of all, the American Constitution went to great length to guarantee genuine equality to States entering into the Union. Neither Ben Franklin nor the other members of the Constitutional Convention would have tolerated a constitution by which two or three or five of the States were given a veto power over all of the rest."

I shall not quote the remainder of it. Within 12 months after we adopted the Charter, one of the most distinguished Members of this body, a Senator who had argued long for it, rose and said it should be amended and that the veto power should be eliminated. But, Mr. President, at the very time we adopted the Charter it was pointed out that it could not be

amended. There is no provision for amendment. So, without being disrespectful at all to the distinguished Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate, I say to them that on their past record I cannot and will not follow, because I have no confidence. In San Francisco, after it had been stated that we would carry out the Atlantic Charter, Australia's distinguished statesman said, just as did our Thirteen Colonies when they got together, "We will have a constitution." But there were representatives from the United States and from England voting "no" and saying, "We must have the veto power."

So, Mr. President, there must be another war fought at some time, I suppose, before we can sit around the peace table and get together and see to it that there shall be no more war.

Mr. President, I now desire to call the Senate's attention to the situation of the aged. At the very time when we increased our own salaries, when we raised our salaries from \$10,000 to \$12,500 and arranged for \$2,500 additional money for expenses for which we did not have to account in our income tax returns, I made a motion that the social security payments which the aged were receiving from the Government should be increased, and suggested that \$100 a month would be a fair increase, in view of the high cost of living.

We increased our own salaries, and we gave the aged the great sum of \$5 a month additional. In some of the States the pioneers, men who were not drunkards, men who were patriotic, hard-working men or women, fine, splendid specimens of womanhood, put their money in banks. Those banks were being examined under both State and Federal authority. Surely those old-timers had a right to rely upon the safety of those banks. But apparently the banks were not very sound, because when President Roosevelt came into office, overnight he declared a bank holiday, and in hundreds and hundreds of banks all over our Nation not 1 cent was paid out to depositors. So we found the old people with their money in closed banks.

I see my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], sitting before me. His State is close to my State of North Dakota. In North Dakota my constituents lost \$61,000,000 in 65 closed banks, in that one little State alone. In Nebraska the situation was worse than it was in the State of North Dakota. But there were those old people, those men who trusted the United States Government, those who believed that when the Federal bank examiner examined a bank it meant something, and they were broke, at a time when we raised our own salaries from \$10,000 to \$12,500, and provided \$2,500 more in an expense account, for which we do not have to account in our income tax. I voted against that bill. I refused to support it unless others also got a corresponding increase.

Mr. President, we find some of these people trying to live on \$25 or \$30, \$35 or \$40, \$45 or \$50, \$55 or \$60, \$65 a month, depending on the particular State, because the Federal Government matches only 50 percent.

I know people who are trying to live on \$28 a month, and they get a letter, we will say, from the welfare board, stating "We took off another dollar," or "We took off another \$2." If any Member of the Senate does not credit that, let him come to my office and I will show him not one, not a dozen, but hundreds of letters from aged people who are trying to get along on these insignificant pittances.

Mr. President, we have money for everybody except the old people of America, who made this country.

I forgot to mention the Indians. We have robbed the Indians ever since I can remember. When I was on the Committee on Indian Affairs I asked the distinguished chairman, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], to name just one treaty, just one, the white man had made with the Indians that had ever been observed, and he could not name one, because there was not one.

There are the Indians starving in New Mexico and California, in my State, and in South Dakota. In New Mexico this year the people of the towns were giving the Indians food and clothing, taking it out to them by truck. In North and South Dakota, when the snow was high, when it was almost impossible to get through, and the Indians were starving, the people tried to help them. In Benson County and in other places the people got together and collected food and clothing so that the Indians would not starve or freeze to death.

Mr. President, I have in my hand an article upon this subject which is most illuminating. It appeared in the Reader's Digest, condensed from the original article in Harper's magazine by Oliver La Farge. I believe the article explains the situation among the Indians about as well as it could be stated. It is entitled "They Were Good Enough for the Army." And the Indians were. Among the Navajos, where the Indians are starving to death, hundreds went into the Army. In Sioux County, N. Dak., the smallest county in my State, 250 Indians volunteered.

Mr. President, let me show how the Indians are treated. I take this from the article in the Reader's Digest. Suppose you are an Indian, poor and old, and your son comes back from the war. Your boy wants an education, but with only three grades he could get into no school except those the Government provided for the Navajo children. Now I read from the article:

With 25,000 children of school age and room for only 6,000, he didn't have a chance. He wanted on-the-job training, but the few jobs on the reservation were filled, and people off the reservation didn't want an ignorant Indian. He wanted to buy a truck and go into freighting, but banks would not lend him money. He wanted to buy cattle and start ranching, but the reservation was already overstocked, and he could not get a grazing permit. He worked on a railroad gang for 6 months and made a little money harvesting carrots; that was all he had been able to find since he was mustered out.

Mr. President, that is the kind of treatment the sons of those Indians have been getting all over this great Nation. I ask unanimous consent that the entire article from which I have been reading, entitled

"They Were Good Enough for the Army," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY WERE GOOD ENOUGH FOR THE ARMY
(Condensed from Harper's Magazine)
(By Oliver La Farge)

The young man sat listlessly on the ground in front of a one-room log shack. With a bony finger he made aimless marks in the dirt. Inside the shack his wife was trying to sleep, since there was nothing to cook. As the baby was not crying he knew that it had fallen asleep, for which he was grateful. They had eaten up their monthly relief check of \$15 from the United States Government. There were still 4 days till the end of the month. He wondered how they would get through next month, how they would get through the winter.

This man is a Navajo Indian—one of thousands who have gone this far toward the end of the trail America has laid out for them. As a boy he had 3 years of schooling, in which he was luckier than most Navajo children, who have none. He failed to contract tuberculosis (which accounts for 45 percent of recorded deaths among Navajos over 20), and thus became one of the 3,600 Navajos who went willingly to war. When he came back he spoke better English; he had seen the world, had lived and fought as an equal among white men. With his mustering-out pay and the GI bill of rights, he was going to do great things.

Slowly he drew a square on the ground, then he made a dot in the middle of it. That was he—boxed in. He wanted an education, but with only three grades he could get into no school except those the Government provided for the Navajo children. With 25,000 children of school age and room for only 6,000 he didn't have a chance. He wanted on-the-job training, but the few jobs on the reservation were filled, and people off the reservation didn't want an ignorant Indian. He wanted to buy a truck and go into freighting, but banks would not lend him money. He wanted to buy cattle and start ranching, but the reservation was already overstocked and he could not get a grazing permit. He worked on a railroad gang for 6 months, and made a little money harvesting carrots; that was all he had been able to find since he was mustered out.

This young man's situation is typical of what the Government and Congress and people of the United States have done to the greatest of our Indian tribes. These are the Navajos, famous for their warlike qualities, their songs, their weaving, and silverworking.

When the Navajos, defeated by Kit Carson, signed the Treaty of 1868, they were settled upon a part of their old homeland. They numbered between 9,000 and 10,000. Under the treaty each Indian received two sheep. They settled down to herding, farming, and the development of their arts. The United States agreed to provide medical care, and to furnish adequate school facilities and a teacher for every 30 Navajo children between the ages of 6 and 13.

The Navajos increased, as they are still increasing, at the rate of about 2 percent each year. Today there are more than 60,000 of them. As the tribe overflowed its reservation, additions were made until the area now comprises 25,000 square miles. By a deal among Senators a law forbids further extensions of their territory.

For 20 years the Indian Service has known that there were nowhere near enough schools or hospitals for the existing Navajo population, yet never has it made a real attempt to secure from Congress the necessary appropriations. As a result, at no time did the United States fulfill its pledges in regard to education and medical service. Never have as many as half the children been in school. Never have we approached anything

like adequate public health and medical service.

Furthermore, the Indians' enormous flocks of sheep, cattle, and horses grossly overstocked their poor grazing land. The land began to deteriorate. In 1933 the Government awoke to the fact that reduction of stock was urgent. Coupled with soil conservation, the reduction program has adjusted the number of animals to somewhere near the carrying capacity of the land, and slowed erosion. But to achieve this, a large part of the Navajo tribe was deprived of its capital.

Without overgrazing, not more than 2,500 Navajo families can earn a poor but tolerable livelihood by herding. As for agriculture, only 23,500 acres can be farmed at present, much of it poor land. About 5,300 of the eleven-thousand-odd Navajo families were able to farm in 1946, and these averaged only \$189 in crops consumed or sold. Of this tribe of 60,000, the present resources of the reservation all combined can support only 35,000. The remainder, 25,000 American citizens, is surplus.

Today the food intake of the average Navajo is several hundred calories below that of the Germans in the territory we occupy. When a Navajo came into a Red Cross office to apply for relief, the worker asked, "Why don't you get a job?"

"I can't. I feel tired all the time."

"I can't put that on the record. What do you mean?"

"Well, you see, sometimes I don't eat for 2 or 3 days."

Many Navajos, in desperation, have consumed their crops while they are still green. This practice tends in one way to alleviate the situation; it kills off many children from colic and diarrhea.

The excess 25,000 Navajos are not idle through choice. They jump at every chance of employment. But these ignorant, underfed, and diseased people cannot even compete equally in the field of common labor. They are the last hired, the first let go. Recognizing that education is the only permanent solution to their problem, their tribal council has sent delegations to Washington to plead for schools. But Congress would not listen and the American people did not care.

This situation could have reached so appalling a point nowhere except in Arizona and New Mexico. They are the only States in the Union in which, by trick devices in their constitutions, Indians are denied the vote. These States also deny all social security to Indians, although Federal funds allotted to them, based on population, include the Indians.

If only as a matter of economy, we should remedy the Navajos' plight. So long as Indians are unable to take care of themselves, they will remain a burden upon the taxpayers at large. The only solution is to build up their health, their economic condition, and their competence until they no longer need special care and Federal protection.

The Navajo Service, a branch of the United States Office of Indian Affairs, has developed a broad program which it is urging upon Washington. It envisages a circle of boarding schools and hospitals in communities around the edges of the reservation, where power, light, and housing are available.

The Service also plans for a careful development of small industries. This is largely an educational project, which can play no important part in the tribe's economy for many years, but should eventually be part of the long-term solution of its problems. The plan further calls for a large-scale development of all irrigable land. This would be a 10-year project, adding 150,500 acres of fertile land to the 23,500 the reservation now possesses. It would provide permanent, stable livelihoods for some Navajo families. All these projects must be accompanied by the building of roads.

If the whole program is completed, there is good hope that at its close, the tribe will be tolerably self-supporting, with a range of skills and semi-skills which will enable the Navajos to compete for jobs outside the reservation. From that time on, education must take over. Steadily increasing numbers of Navajos must be made capable of getting on without artificial aids and protections in the white man's world.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, we now come to consider demands for more money. I picked up the newspaper last night and noted that South American countries want half a billion dollars. The day before, I picked up the paper and noticed that the President expressed a desire to give Greece and Turkey some additional hundreds of millions of dollars.

I thought I had a pretty good education when I left Columbia, but I have found that in giving out relief money there are countries benefiting which I did not even know existed. There is a little island some place in the ocean, for example. It is said we need that island because a base may be put on it at some time, so there is a request for a few hundred million dollars more.

The symbol of some of the major political parties should be a scoop shovel instead of some other implement, to show how we scoop out the money and give it away, under the bipartisan policy of the United States Government.

Now, Mr. President, we come to the blind, and find a little miserable pittance given the blind and the physically handicapped. When I was Governor of my State there were 241 physically handicapped people in the State, and a miserable little wage was paid to a man to go around and call on them once in a while. Time and time again he said he was unable to get even the equipment to educate a physically handicapped boy or girl; and that was long before the war started.

Then, Mr. President, we come to REA. I repeat what I stated on this floor a few days ago. A year and a half ago, when I was campaigning in my State, no matter whether the audience was large or whether it was small, when I invited questions, the questions were not, "Are we going to balance the budget?"; they were not, "Are we going to have tax reduction?"; but from one end of the State to the other the men and women, especially the women, asked, "When are we going to get REA upon our farms?"

I venture to say, Mr. President, that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the acting majority leader, has had the same experience in the State of Nebraska. He has spoken, as I have, to many farmers who wanted to know when they were going to be able to get refrigerators so their meat would not spoil. They wanted to know when electricity would be furnished to them, so they could have electric light in their homes instead of smoking lamps. The farmers wanted to know when they would get lights in their stables and barns so that they could take proper care of their livestock; they wanted to know when they could secure power to turn the wheels of the various machines used on the farm. I do not need to mention the need for electric power in connection with radios.

Do Senators know how many little motors there are on an average farm? There are 40. Believe it or not, on an average farm there are 40 little motors used for dishwashing machines, for vacuum cleaners, for implements, and machines of various kinds. Yet it was said that all we could have for REA was \$300,000,000. Believe it or not, \$45,000,000 was cut off from the amount provided in the bill, and \$300,000,000 finally given. Mind you, Mr. President, that money is not poured down a rat hole the way some money has been sunk in rat holes in foreign countries since we have been giving it away. I myself one day heard the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee say that aid to a certain country would never be paid back. But every penny of the money provided for REA is paid back to the Government. At the present time, \$17,000,000 not yet due has been paid back in advance to the Government under REA. Of all the REA cooperatives in the United States, only one is now in default. Yet with that marvelous record, our Government will not provide sufficient funds to give the farmers the chance to get the power they need through REA. If the money were appropriated so that REA could furnish to the farmers the power and light which they need, it would be paid back with interest. Before the war 95 out of every 100 farmers in Germany had electric power. The same was true in Finland, Sweden, Norway, and some other countries. The men over there took good care of their women, while we in America do not take good care of our farm women. That is the record.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LANGER. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator going to place in the RECORD at this point the amount of money which is to be allocated for the purposes of reconstruction in western Europe while money for like purposes has been denied here in America?

Mr. LANGER. If the Senator will furnish it to me I shall be glad to place it in the RECORD.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator's statement has been quite revealing to me. My understanding is that for the projected 4-year period the allocations to the 16 countries in question will be \$5,000,000,000 for power and \$5,000,000,000 for electrical distribution, and out of the first year's appropriation the allocation for the 16 countries is \$300,000,000 for power and \$300,000,000 for electrical distribution—to come out of the money the United States contributes, which is more money than the United States is allotting to its own citizens for the same purpose.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from Nebraska. There is no Senator upon the Senate floor who, in my opinion, is better informed about farm conditions than is the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. President, over the period of the next few years, as I said, \$75,000,000,000

should be provided for roads and buildings, \$8,000,000,000 for health, \$1,500,000,000 for Federal employees each year for 15 years, or a total of 21 or 22 billion dollars; \$15,000,000,000 over a 5-year period for the veterans; \$2,000,000,000 for Federal aid for school teachers over a 3-year period; \$8,000,000,000 for Federal housing over a 4-year period, at \$2,000,000,000 a year.

Then we come to universal military training. General Eisenhower says he wants it. General Bradley says he wants it. Almost without exception the military authorities want universal military training. The only general I have found so far who has opposed it is, according to rumor, General MacArthur in Japan. He has certainly not publicly endorsed it, as I am informed.

Let us look at all the billions of dollars we are going to give to foreign countries. I do not know how many hundreds of millions of dollars or billions of dollars we will provide to foreign countries, but I shall be conservative and say we will give \$5,000,000,000 in addition to the Marshall plan, scattered among the 35 or 40 countries which, it is claimed, are eligible to receive aid. Of course, Japan, we can understand, wants a few billion dollars also. I do not want to forget Japan.

Then, Mr. President, a couple of billion dollars should be provided for the aged. I hope a billion dollars can be provided for REA.

At the present time there are literally a hundred million dollars' worth of claims filed with the Indian Claims Commission. We created that Commission a long time ago, but we have not paid out any money; so sooner or later we shall have to pay the claims which may be adjudicated.

Then, of course, there is the post-office equipment I described a while ago. There are 42,000 post offices; so one can figure how many million dollars that is going to take.

Mr. President, I do not want to take up much more of the time of the Senate. I desire to place in the RECORD, however, an article by Alexander Boeker, published in the Progressive, of Madison, Wis. The article is entitled "The Last Laugh Is Hitler's—Allied Expulsion of 20,000,000 Europeans From Their Homes Shows How Heavily We Have Borrowed From the Nazism We Hate."

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LAST LAUGH IS HITLER'S—ALLIED EXPULSION OF 20,000,000 EUROPEANS FROM THEIR HOMES SHOWS HOW HEAVILY WE HAVE BORROWED FROM THE NAZISM WE HATED

(By Alexander Boeker)

Hitler's armies were smashed on the field of battle, but many of nazism's most savage political weapons remained to dominate the victors. The mass expulsion of helpless civilians was one of the most barbarous of Nazi instruments of terror and upheaval. Today, nearly 3 years after the successful conclusion of the war to crush Hitlerism, 20,000,000 human beings in Europe are penned up on alien soil against their will. They have been forcibly expelled from their ancestral homes

and accustomed places of work in eastern Europe by the victorious powers.

Little is written and nothing is said by the leading statesmen of the world on this peacetime crime which rivals the war crimes of the Nazis. Perhaps there is good reason, for the magnitude of the problem staggers the imagination. Moreover, there is the psychological factor of guilt. Many of our leading statesmen are deeply implicated in the decisions which have produced so much human suffering and such social chaos. Any mention of the subject, even for the purpose of finding constructive remedies, is therefore distasteful to them.

It has been left to the churches—Protestant and Catholic—and to a few private individuals and organizations, like the Committee Against Mass Expulsions, to face the issue frankly. Said Pope Pius XII in his Christmas address of 1947:

"Men of the postwar period could have easily confronted this degeneracy—I, e., that of the Nazis—with their own moral superiority. Unfortunately, in not a few instances they have let slip this golden opportunity. * * * Dante * * * would have shrunk from depicting the reprisals wrought upon the innocent. There followed forced migrations and compulsory hard labor, defying the most elementary laws of humanity as well as the letter and the spirit of the law of nations."

Heartening as such protests are, they will avail nothing until the political leaders of the great powers, notably the United States, are prepared to admit their past mistakes and search honestly for new and honest solutions. The problems caused by the policy of mass expulsions in Europe are too great to take care of themselves. To delay decisive action now can only result in making the problem more difficult and complicated.

What is the issue?

Anxious to appease territorial designs and nationalist aspirations of the Soviets and their satellites, and blinded by wartime passions and sentiments of revenge, the leaders of the United States and Great Britain consented to the redrawing of frontiers in defiance of all ethnographic, historical, or economic factors.

Aware of the iniquity of such arrangements, they agreed with the Soviets that a clean sweep should be made of the troublesome populations that stood in the way of the settlement. Whereas all civilized statesmen of the past, particularly Woodrow Wilson, had tried to fit frontiers to populations, the wartime leaders of the Big Three decided to fit populations to frontiers. Whoever lived on the wrong side of an arbitrary new border was to be expelled.

The forced migrations thus brought about exceeded in scope and cruelty anything that had happened in Europe since the dawn of history—excepting only Hitler's war of extermination on the Jews. Even the Nazi attempts at the resettlement of Volksdeutsche and Poles, grim as they were, were merely a mild foretaste of what has happened under Allied auspices since the end of the war.

Nearly 3,000,000 Poles from east of the Curzon line have been pushed westward and dumped into areas from which Germans had been expelled; about half a million Ukrainians were resettled within Poland or expelled to the Soviet Union; some 700,000 Hungarians in Czechoslovakia are being dislodged from their century-old homes; several hundred thousand Balts are being deported into the interior of Russia.

The most staggering problem of all, in terms of magnitude, is the uprooting of some 16,000,000 Germans in eastern Europe, of whom about 11,000,000 have so far been dumped into decimated Germany—7,000,000 in the western zones and 4,000,000 in the Soviet zone. Between four and five million or between 20 and 25 percent of the total, are simply missing.

In the heartless language of officialdom, these missing millions represent the rate of attrition. To you and me this means that that many people have perished in the process of expulsion, from lack of food or shelter or from maltreatment. Included in this figure may be as many as a million who were deported eastward as slave laborers, where their life expectancy is small indeed. A few hundred thousand may still be living in their old homes, waiting to be expelled, or for the hurricane of nationalist fury and hate to subside.

The great majority of these German expellees, approximately 10 million, come from what had since time immemorial been eastern Germany—the ancient provinces of Silesia, Pomerania, Brandenburg, and East Prussia. Another three million are Sudeten Germans, many of whom had been loyal citizens of Czechoslovakia up to the day of their expulsion. The remaining three million are made up of scattered German-speaking minorities from the Baltic to the Black Sea—people who had never been German citizens. Their ancestors had migrated to Eastern Europe to clear forests and drain swamps or to rebuild areas shattered by Mongolian and Turkish invasions.

As the Red army swept westward into the heart of Europe, establishing Communist puppet regimes along its path, the long and fearful agony of these people began. They were deprived of their civil rights, stripped of their property, and finally herded into concentration camps or driven westward into the occupation zones of Germany and Austria. All reports agree that maltreatment and sadistic cruelties were—and still are—an everyday feature of these expulsions. A new chapter has been added to the tragic story of man's inhumanity to man, rivaling the worst excesses of Nazi barbarism.

On arrival in western Germany or Austria, these refugee hordes are far from finding a warm welcome. In a hungry, cold, and shattered country, with its economy artificially throttled, there is little room for human compassion and Christian charity. Everyone is out for himself, and the local population often bitterly resents that it has to share its scarce food, its cramped living quarters, and its few household goods with destitute strangers from the East, who may be their uninvited guests for an indefinite time to come.

Differences in accent and in cultural traditions aggravate the problem. Thus the expellee feels an outcast in his new surroundings which he is told will henceforth be his home. In all too many cases no room at all can be found in private houses; hence hundreds of thousands of expellees still live in unsanitary camps, 10 and 20 to a room, with no prospect at all of finding new homes of their own.

It has been suggested that the only solution for the problem is a vast program of overseas emigration. Such a plan, if speedily carried out, would no doubt provide much relief. But the imagination balks at the shipping space and capital needed to transport more than 10,000,000 people to distant places; the very magnitude of the problem would require that it be extended over a decade or more. There is also considerable doubt that enough countries would be willing to absorb so large a mass of needy immigrants. Last but not least, the expellees themselves, for the most part, do not wish to go overseas, but back to their old homes.

While emigration could thus provide relief, it cannot provide a solution. More promising is the suggestion that western Germany be sufficiently reindustrialized to permit the absorption of the expellees. There is no doubt that a plan of this sort would substantially alleviate the present problem. Pauperization in its most acute

form could be averted. But few who advocate this idea seem to realize the extent of reindustrialization required. Sober estimates show that Germany would have to double her prewar and predepression exports to be able to buy enough food and raw materials to take care of her swollen population. Yet, even under the Marshall plan, the volume of German industrial production is to be substantially below prewar standards.

German steel production, the basis of Germany's chief export industry (machinery, tools, etc.), is to be held down to 60 percent of the 1928-29 level. It is manifestly impossible to accomplish the absorption of the expellees, or even a major portion of them, on this basis. Nor is it at all likely that so expanded an export industry would find sufficient markets for its goods throughout the world, especially at a time when Great Britain is also forced to expand her export volume far beyond prewar limits.

The only real and lasting solution can come through the return to their homes of the great bulk of the expelled populations and through just territorial arrangements that will guarantee that they shall live as equal citizens under the law. If this solution is impossible immediately, it must, nevertheless, be our constant aim. Otherwise sham solutions will be adopted, capable only of lulling the world into a false sense of security.

Meanwhile, the expellee problem must be lifted out of the category of unmentionable subjects. A bold and adequate relief scheme must be devised. Since the constitution of the International Refugee Organization (IRO), sponsored by the United States Government and adopted by the Senate, bars refugees of German ethnic origin from the benefits of that organization—Hitler's Aryan clause in reverse—a new organization, specially devoted to ethnically German expellees must be created. The tasks to be faced by this organization are as vast as they are important.

As emigration overseas and to such underpopulated countries as France gets under way, relief needs can be slowly reduced. Further, and greater, reductions will come as Germany's industries again reach, and finally exceed, their peacetime production figures. Under present plans, however, this will not be the case for many years to come. It is woefully clear, therefore, that if the Marshall plan is to bring stability to western Europe, it must take full account of the economic and political problems caused by the ruthless expulsion from their homes of millions of people.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to read one or two paragraphs from the article, so that the many Senators upon the floor will clearly understand what the article contains. Mind you, Mr. President, these people are not included in the displaced persons legislation which was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary by a vote of 9 to 1, I being the only member who voted against it. There are 1,323,000 displaced persons in Europe, as the word "displaced" is defined in the measure upon which we are going to vote in a few days. Who does it not include, Mr. President? I shall read a few paragraphs from the article which appeared in the *Progressive*. I read from page 9:

Anxious to appease territorial designs and nationalist aspirations of the Soviets and their satellites, and blinded by wartime passions of sentiments and revenge, the leaders of the United States and Great Britain consented to the redrawing of frontiers in defiance of all ethnographic, historical, or economic factors.

Mr. President, my mind goes back to a speech made by the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt in the month of October, a year and a half before the war ended. He said, "We are not fighting the women and children of Germany. We are fighting Hitler."

What happened when the war was over? The President of the United States signed the document which I placed in the *Record* yesterday, a document consenting to the enslavement of millions of white people. I am against the enslavement of anyone, whether he be red or black, yellow or white. I thought it was the policy in the United States to be against slavery of every kind, character, or description.

But in the document which I placed in the *Record* yesterday, we consented to the enslavement of millions of people. Let me read the first paragraph of it again:

The three governments, have considered the question in all its aspects, recognize that the transfer to Germany of German populations, or elements thereof, remaining in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, will have to be undertaken. They agree that any transfers that take place should be effected in an orderly and humane manner.

So, Mr. President, because a man had German blood in him, even though for 500 years he and his ancestors may have been living in Poland, Czechoslovakia, or Hungary, he is taken away—with what results? Let me continue and show with what result. I read from the article in the *Progressive* magazine:

Aware of the iniquity of such arrangements, they agreed with the Soviets that a "clean sweep" should be made of the "troublesome populations" that stood in the way of the settlement. Whereas all civilized statesmen of the past, particularly Woodrow Wilson, had tried to fit frontiers to populations, the wartime leaders of the Big Three decided to fit populations to frontiers. Whoever lived on the wrong side of an arbitrary new border was to be expelled.

The forced migrations thus brought about exceeded in scope and cruelty anything that had happened in Europe since the dawn of history—excepting only Hitler's war of extermination on the Jews. Even the Nazi attempts at the resettlement of Volksdeutsche and Poles, grim as they were, were merely a mild foretaste of what has happened under Allied auspices since the end of the war.

Listen to this:

Nearly 3,000,000 Poles from east of the Curzon line have been pushed westward and dumped into areas from which Germans had been expelled; about half a million Ukrainians were resettled within Poland or expelled to the Soviet Union; some 700,000 Hungarians in Czechoslovakia are being dislodged from their century-old homes; several hundred thousand Balts are being deported into the interior of Russia.

Listen carefully, Mr. President:

The most staggering problem of all, in terms of magnitude, is the uprooting of some 16,000,000 Germans in eastern Europe, of whom about 11,000,000 have so far been dumped into decimated Germany—7,000,000 in the western zones and 4,000,000 in the Soviet zone. Between four and five million, or between 20 and 25 percent of the total, are simply missing.

So our Government has to feed 7,000,000 more; and the \$73,000,000 we

have appropriated to feed those people over there is entirely insufficient.

In the heartless language of officialdom, these missing millions represent the rate of attrition. To you and me this means that that many people have perished in the process of expulsion, from lack of food or shelter or from maltreatment. Included in this figure may be as many as a million who were deported eastward as slave laborers, where their life expectancy is small indeed. A few hundred thousand may still be living in their old homes, waiting to be expelled, or for the hurricane of nationalist fury and hate to subside.

The great majority of these German expellees—

This is important, Mr. President. It is frightfully important, because whether we listen to the testimony of General Clay or whether we listen to the testimony of some of the other outstanding citizens of this country, we are continually and everlastingly reminded that Germany must not go communistic; that if it does, all of Europe is gone. If our great leaders do not want Germany to go communistic, then certainly they have a very strange way of treating these people. Here is a country of, roughly, 60,000,000 people, who have not enough to eat. Our country is already feeding those people. Then come 10,000,000 more. When we pass the displaced persons bill, unless it is amended, not a single one of those 10,000,000 can be brought to this country, no matter how fine a record he may have had in the past. Although next to people of British origin, the largest population we have in America is of Teutonic origin, we cannot bring in a single one.

The great majority of these German expellees, approximately 10,000,000, come from what had since time immemorial been eastern Germany—the ancient Provinces of Silesia, Pomerania, Brandenburg, and East Prussia. Another 3,000,000 are Sudeten Germans, many of whom had been loyal citizens of Czechoslovakia up to the day of their expulsion. The remaining 3,000,000 are made up of scattered German-speaking minorities from the Baltic to the Black Sea, people who had never been German citizens. Their ancestors had migrated to eastern Europe to clear forests and drain swamps or to rebuild areas shattered by Mongolian and Turkish invasions.

As the Red army swept westward into the heart of Europe, establishing Communist puppet regimes along its path, the long and fearful agony of these people began. They were deprived of their civil rights, stripped of their property, and finally herded into concentration camps or driven westward into the occupation zones of Germany and Austria. All reports agree that maltreatment and sadistic cruelties were—and still are—an everyday feature of these expulsions. A new chapter has been added to the tragic story of "man's inhumanity to man," rivaling the worst excesses of Nazi barbarism.

Yesterday we were solemnly assured that steel would not be affected if we were to pass the pending bill. I took the trouble to look over the report of the Herter committee of the House of Representatives. What does that committee say, Mr. President? It says this:

Unless . . . means can be found to raise significantly the level of production in western Germany, very heavy, and perhaps intolerable, sacrifices will have to be made by American consumers of steel (in 1948).

There you have it. That is from the Herter Committee Report No. 6, of November 12, 1947.

What about the steel situation in the United States? At the very time when we need it, we are going to ship it away.

I read now an article from the New York Herald Tribune of February 10, 1948, which, among other things, says:

RECORD DEMAND

Plans to build 7,600 more miles of pipe line have been announced in the United States. But pipe is so short that probably not more than 1,500 miles will be built by the end of this year.

Again I appeal to the distinguished acting majority leader, who is chairman of the Small Business Committee, and I ask him whether the demand for any other commodity has been any greater than the demand for steel for pipe during the past 2½ years.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if that question is directed to me as chairman of the committee referred to, I should like to state that I think the commodity in shortest supply in the United States today is steel. It was in such short supply last summer that the distinguished Senator will recall that the Small Business Committee made superhuman efforts to get pipe sent to North Dakota, South Dakota, and other States during the drought, for watering purposes.

I also say for the RECORD now that we are behind 67,000 oil wells in the United States, by which we would otherwise get oil production, which includes wildcat wells and wells in proven areas, for the reason that we do not have the pipe to supply the wells.

I simply wish to impress upon the Members of the Senate, as chairman of the Small Business Committee, that I concur in the statement made by the Senator from North Dakota that today steel is in very short supply in the United States.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, here is an article from the New York Times of February 12:

The Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Co. is prepared to pay a \$20,000,000 premium, if necessary, to obtain 400,000 tons of steel.

That was the substance of sworn testimony before the Federal Power Commission, as reported in the New York Times on February 12.

If there is anyone within the sound of my voice who wishes to make \$20,000,000 this year, all he has to do is find 400,000 tons of steel, and the Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Co. will gladly pay him a \$20,000,000 premium.

The following article appeared in the New York Times on February 20, just 2 or 3 weeks ago:

Present steel production (in western Germany) is 3,000,000 tons annually, against the prewar figure of 18,000,000 tons.

The article is by Anne O'Hare McCormick, in the New York Times of February 20.

Here is another article:

PRICES SOAR

All domestic producers of steel announced yesterday price increases of approximately \$5 a ton (which) may be reflected ultimately

in higher prices for a broad line of industrial items, ranging from automobiles to small appliances.

That is from the New York Times of February 20, 1948.

Meanwhile, Mr. President, the Senate is planning to investigate why steel went up in price. Here is one explanation. It is the height of economic folly to continue to dismantle plants. But we can get steel by stopping at once the dismantling of plants. That is one way to get steel.

Here is an editorial from the Christian Century, of February 25, 1948:

Such a letter as Secretary Marshall wrote to Senator VANDENBERG on February 4 raises a question as to whether there is any such thing as a Marshall plan for the rebuilding of Europe or, if there is, whether the Secretary of State knows about it.

The Marshall letter defended the policy of dismantling industrial plants in western Germany on the ground that these plants had been promised to our allies as reparations under the Potsdam agreement, that they would produce more for the benefit of general European and world trade in their new locations, and that if we halted dismantling, our French and British allies would then demand "extensive reparations out of current production."

The Potsdam agreement was an attempt to reduce Germany to the Morgenthau "goat pasture" economy. Russia has already ripped it to shreds. If the State Department is still following the Morgenthau-Potsdam blueprints, then the Marshall plan is a fake, and a hopeless fake at that.

It is simply not true that dismantled and relocated industrial plants produce more. Only machinery can be moved; installations take time. And industrial engineers agree that production is cut by as much as 90 percent.

So far as additional demands from France and England are concerned, hasn't Mr. Marshall heard that the United States is getting ready to provide those countries with billions to restore their productivity? If there is to be an ERP, continued destruction of the productive capacity of western Germany must stop.

When the Marshall plan bill comes to the floor of the Senate, a prohibition against any more such folly should be written into it immediately.

Mr. President, there is one other matter which I should like to place in the RECORD. It is an editorial by William B. Ziff, perhaps the leading authority in the United States on aircraft. This editorial appeared in the magazine Flying for November 1947. I ask unanimous consent to have it placed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. MARSHALL SUFFERS A LAPSE OF MEMORY

It is difficult to understand what has happened to George Marshall.

As a general, he was known as a tough, hard-hitting guy whose good sense was unchallengeable. He knew that in the jungle of international lawlessness, after the politicians finished trying to out-slick each other, the issue would be determined by American strength and nothing else.

But the moment Mr. Marshall found himself in striped trousers, he seemed to forget all the hard lessons he learned when he was Chief of Staff. Today we are right back where we were before Pearl Harbor Day.

Reduced to a capsule, what are the simple facts of our present situation? They are these:

1. An undeclared state of war exists between the Government of the United States and that of the U. S. S. R.

2. As matters now are going, this sooner or later will develop into a shooting war.

Our Nation seems to have a choice of two courses.

1. We can abandon all the play-acting and enter into direct conversations with the Russians on the frank thesis that we and they are the only two powers in the world that matter, and try to find some way of getting along with them.

2. We can lay down the law saying, "Look, Joe, it's either this or else."

In any case, the answer will not be given by hand-outs and bribes to two-bit kings, parasitic politicians, and Marxist fanatics, whose antics have all but bankrupt their own states. If we cannot protect ourselves and our way of life by our own will and power, this gentry certainly will not do it for us.

In a world-jungle infested with cynical and conscienceless self-seekers, there is only one real protection—the power of the national arms. Our most convincing argument in any case will be an invincible air force backed by a strong and healthy industry, and linked with an air-transport system capable of laying down whole armies on enemy territory within a matter of hours. Whatever funny kind of thinking may course through Russian skulls, it can be deemed certain that they possess at least a normal aversion to suicide.

Of all men, Mr. Marshall must know that today the United States is fat, rich, and unready. Our aviation industry, on which the national security must ultimately rest, is for all good intents and purposes, busted. Its irreplaceable engineers are rapidly drifting away. Its plants are shutting down. We are turning out fewer airplanes today than we did in the bitter days before the war when the advocates of air power were looked upon as so many wild-eyed zealots. Our Air Force has dwindled to the point where we could hardly put two whole squadrons of first-line aircraft in the field at one time. To say that it has become third-rate, is no exaggeration.

Since we are facing the prospect of a fight with someone both big and tough—perhaps bigger and tougher than anyone we have ever tangled with in the past—it would seem reasonable that when Mr. Marshall announces that he has a plan, the plan will be something to make us strong and unbeatable.

Instead it turns out that Mr. Marshall has developed a banker complex. The great plan comes down to a scheme for bigger and better hand-outs.

Mr. Marshall has simply found himself out-matched. The do-gooders, the social lads, and the slick boys in the diplomatic department, have taken him over.

The whole record of the State Department's policy scheme has been one of screwball politics and even worse economics. It has played its hand from weakness, inconsistency and illogic. Its estimates have continually gone awry. Its assurances to the American people have been empty of sound thinking. Every proposition it has stated has turned out to be wrong. Had any of the men responsible for these policies been employed in private enterprise, or in the magnificent Army Mr. Marshall once built, they would have been turned out to pasture long ago.

The record speaks for itself: Yalta and Teheran; Russia is a democracy; the United Nations will solve all; Bretton Woods will solve all; the British loan will solve all; and so on and on.

No part of this vast program of money spending has produced any sound result. These great sums simply have been piddled down the drain.

Take the case of the British loan, for example:

This was supposed to put Britain on her feet. It was to have been used to modernize

British industry and relieve us of the conspiratorial strictures aimed against American trade in the operations of the so-called sterling bloc. Instead the money was used for imperial adventures all over the world, on profligate spending everywhere, British troops in Egypt, Palestine, North Ireland, eastern Asia and elsewhere—1,500,000 in all. It went to underwrite the fiscal deficits of Burma and such barbaric states as Saudi Arabia, for the support of the dangerous Moslem bloc, for world-wide propaganda operations, and for vast schemes of social experimentation which have not worked out.

Meanwhile 1 in every 10 workers is on the Government pay roll. Production has dropped disastrously.

Another instance is the loan to Greece and Turkey. These little nations, with their tissue-paper armies, are supposed to protect the United States against communism. Today we learn that they are to be armed with obsolete Spitfires and other outmoded war material coming out of British surplus equipment. This is with the full consent of the American State Department.

Mr. Marshall should know that in war second-class equipment is a first-class invitation to disaster.

Meanwhile, the American aircraft industry, which is well capable of turning out superior equipment and machines, is disintegrating for lack of orders.

Not satisfied with what we have already done, Mr. Bevin publicly condemns us for not throwing the Fort Knox gold into his share-the-wealth program. He also thinks there should be a new American lend-lease program.

Yet, at a time when we are arguing with the Russians, he thinks it is all right to negotiate a trade deal with them by which they would be supplied with heavy machinery they would need badly in case of war with the United States.

Mr. Bevin, of course, is not alone in his ideas. He is joined by representatives of many other nations in the general expectation that Uncle Sam has an obligation to take care of them. If the British miners under their acknowledged Communist chief, Arthur Horner, refuse to work, American miners must work harder. If the Dutch wanted to shoot up Indonesia, America should produce more in order to foot the bill; or if the French and British want to turn all Asia against us by their conscienceless exploitation of subject peoples, America should pay for this, too.

All that anyone needs to do these days is to yell "communism" in a loud voice, in order to blackmail our State Department into handing out almost anything they ask for.

The beneficiaries of these hand-outs are, for the most part, frankly devoted to social systems destructive to the American principle of free enterprise. Each of them is involved in a morass of trade and currency conspiracy aimed at smashing each other's commerce. They are ruled for the most part by cynical and calculating politicians who hold the ordinary restraints of decent conduct in contempt where gain is concerned.

The plain fact of the matter is that if Europe would drop its selfish, greedy dog-eat-dog tactics and come together in some sort of a political and customs union, it could produce what it needs.

A reasonable program would involve our advising Europe to quit all this horsing around, drop their sterling blocs and other monetary conspiracies, abandon the trade embargoes and water-tight nationalisms which make doing business there a horror, eliminate their expensive and dangerous imperial adventures, and join with us in building an honest free-trade world economy. Along with the other self-seeking hokum, European states could quit subjecting our people to this incessant barrage of propaganda. That costs money, too, which could better be put to productive purposes.

Of course, this would be doing it the hard way.

If it isn't done, however, even the astronomical amounts asked by Messrs. Bevin and Marshall will not last long.

The fact is that in the case of Britain alone there is an annual gap of at least \$4,000,000,000 between what she produces and sells and what she needs. Other countries in Europe are relatively in a similar situation.

As long as these states continue with their present tactics, the situation will grow worse, not better.

If we are to be in a real struggle with the Russians, there is no reason to believe that any of these states will be on our side. We have already become Uncle Shylock to many of them. There is at least a 50-50 chance that Britain itself will be neutral. The miners have served notice that they will not mine coal in a war against Russia. They are joined in this view by other powerful factors in British public life.

If the intention is to halt communism, the record shows that this banking scheme will not work. Since we began this vast system of WPA politics, communism has not been pushed back, but has gained heavily in Europe, and in Britain itself.

The vast amounts Mr. Marshall now mentions are not trick figures on a Monopoly board. They represent at a conservative estimate some 20 years' income tax on the part of every taxpaying American. They will have to be paid for in real, tangible values—the sweat and labor of men, the stuff grown from the earth, or mined from its bowels. They represent irreplaceable wealth and the toil of hard-working Americans. This scheme means that every American must work harder. If this program is instituted on the scale proposed by Mr. Marshall, it means the reinstitution of all the old war-time controls. There will be less of everything for every American, less farm machinery, fewer automobiles and houses, less food.

The plain fact is that we would not be handing out these sums abroad from a surplus. A nation which lacks 12,000,000 homes in which to house its workers, and whose most important security industry, aviation manufacturing, is facing bankruptcy because of lack of orders, has no surplus.

If it were true that some fine moral purpose could be served by this design, and if the scheme itself took second place to expenditures aimed at making America strong at home, some kind of help-the-world plan might be feasible.

But America is not strong at home. Our internal problem presents serious difficulties. We have not yet made the transition to a healthy peacetime economy. Our essential machinery is obsolescent and badly needs replacement. Our building industry is at a standstill.

As far as good old Uncle Sam is concerned, he can have sympathy for whom he pleases, but he also is duty bound to look out for himself. To be safe against the Communist menace, both on the outside as well as within our borders, America must be strong and prosperous, not bled white. Even three or four billion dollars spent on building up a top-notch air service would be sufficient to give us security and the authority which goes with power.

If trouble with the Russians is really expected, we have to be in a position to deliver instantaneously a blow of such staggering proportions that no one in his right mind would dream of challenging us.

A sensible plan would be to examine our own situation, not to see how much we can give away, but to determine how we can put our own house in order, how we can feed and house our own people, and how we can best serve notice on would-be aggressors that if there is to be a war, it will be fought over their territory, not ours.

This brings us back inevitably to the need for the biggest air establishment we know how to make. It brings us directly to the need for placing a firm floor under the aircraft industry which is now dying.

As for Europe, it either should make some sense out of its own internal processes, or we should get the hell out of there.

WILLIAM B. ZIFF.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in the editorial which I have just had placed in the RECORD I notice that Mr. Ziff says:

Meanwhile 1 in every 10 workers is on the Government pay roll.

He refers to the workers in Britain. I hope the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who is so worried about a few days of sick leave for Government workers, will read that editorial carefully.

Finally, Mr. President, I have before me a document entitled "The United Nations Charter." First of all, I want to make it clear that I did everything in my power to keep Edward R. Stettinius, of the house of Morgan, from becoming Secretary of State. His father had been a member of the house of Morgan, as I have previously said upon this floor, during World War I, when the house of Morgan made \$30,000,000 by representing England. I said upon the floor at that time that he had been chairman of the United States Steel Corp. For 3 hours I talked against the confirmation of the nomination of Edward R. Stettinius to be Secretary of State. I said then that he was not fitted for that position, and, sure enough, he so utterly showed his incapacity at San Francisco that, within a few weeks after he returned from that city, he was no longer Secretary of State. The administration got rid of him. The pity of it is that his nomination was ever confirmed.

It will be peculiarly appropriate today, in examining the Charter of the United Nations, to look at article I, paragraph 3. I shall read it, because I am sure many Senators have forgotten it. Through the adoption of the Charter we were all to become sisters and brothers all over the world. Let me read the purpose of the United Nations, for whose charter the Senators who are here today, with the exception of myself, voted to ratify. It reads as follows:

To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for the fundamental freedoms of all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

Mr. President, that is what was voted for on the floor of the Senate. Not only were we all to become brothers and sisters in America, regardless of color, race, or creed, but America was to set an example for the other nations of the world. In the city of New York, Puerto Ricans were no longer to be discriminated against; their children were to be allowed to attend school with the little children from Harlem and from the area around One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Street, One Hundred and Twenty-sixth Street, and Amsterdam Avenue. No longer was there to be any discrimination against the Japanese citizens in California, or against Mexicans in Cali-

fornia, or against East Indians in California, some of whom up to that time did not even own land and could not even obtain a driver's license in California, Arizona, and certain other States. All were to become brothers and sisters, red, white, yellow, and black. That was the purpose of the Charter for which the Senate voted. When Russia's veto power is mentioned, I wonder what certain of the people in China and Africa and India think about the citizens of the United States whose representatives approved this Charter, and then, within a few weeks very conveniently forgot all about it.

In order that we might all become brothers and sisters, in order that we might walk arm in arm with everyone else, red, yellow, and black, and become real brothers and sisters, it is said that the fourth purpose is "to be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends."

The buildings of the United Nations Organization were located in the city of New York, so that we in America could become shining examples of how people should love each other, and to show that in this country there is no discrimination because of race, sex, language, or religion.

Mr. President, I appeal now to the record. The United States has had charge of Puerto Rico for a long time. Go there and look at its slums. Look at them, and consider that the United States Government has had charge of that country for so long a time. They are the most filthy, the most unspeakably dirty slums in the world. But we expect to take care of the whole world. We expect to take care of Korea, Manchuria, India, wherever we are afraid of communism, which is found almost everywhere, including our own country. We expect to take care of everyone. But in little Puerto Rico we cannot even wipe out the slums.

With reference to Alaska, we have had that Territory under our care for more than 75 years. When I introduced a bill providing for statehood for the Territory of Alaska, believe it or not, certain men said that Territory was not fit to govern itself.

It is significant, Mr. President, that in his opening speech the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee said:

Many other features of the pending bill will develop with the debate. At the moment, I refer, finally, to only two.

Second, the investment of private American capital, in approved reconstruction projects in the 16 countries and western Germany, is encouraged by our guaranty of the subsequent convertibility of profits or original investment into dollars. This obviates the hazard most likely to prevent private investment. At the same time it is a highly practical invitation to American private initiative to join in this great adventure on a free-enterprise basis.

Our representatives go into South American countries where there are graduates of Harvard, Columbia, Princeton, the University of Pennsylvania, and all the other large schools of the United States. Why, in heaven's name, is it necessary for American dollars to go in

and control the banks there? Why establish branches of the Chase National Bank? The people of Puerto Rico are our brothers, as are the people of Colombia or Guatemala, or any other of the South American countries. In Puerto Rico there are 2,000,000 people, but because Puerto Rico is a Territory of the United States we establish American banks there. We should get those people together and say, "You are smart enough to run your own bank. We will loan you money, but you yourselves should establish your own bank. We are not imperialists." Instead of that, we are establishing branch banks of the Chase National Bank or the National City Bank, or branch banks of any of the other great chains in this country. Wherever we go we find the large banks of New York establishing branch banks. The Puerto Ricans, who were great leaders in the arts and sciences, are fully capable and are competent to operate their own businesses if we loan them money and do not give it to them. They can establish their banks and their financial centers for themselves.

I voted against the British loan of \$3,750,000,000. I voted against the loan to Greece and Turkey. That money has since been wasted. I voted against sending money to China, which a leading Senator said was a "rat hole" operation. I voted against the \$497,000,000 sent to Italy, Austria, and France—not to the people, but to their governments; which change overnight. But I voted to send any necessary food or clothing where it was needed. I would vote to keep any man, woman, or child from starving; but, Mr. President, I have had too much experience in this world not to know that the governments which receive the money will be just as bitter as was England when we shut off lend-lease. Some of the statesmen over there are like Bevin, who said they wanted us to make a gift of American gold which is now stored in Kentucky. I know that no matter how much we do, no matter how much of a gift we make, we shall not make friends of the recipients of the gift. If it be to the best interests of any one of those countries to be against the United States of America, they will be against us. The giving of this money will not tie them to us. If the money were loaned through the Export-Import Bank there might be a different story.

Finally, Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that I believe the United States should use the money for the benefit of the underprivileged one-third of our population. I believe we should pay Indian claims, some of which are over 100 years old. I believe we should provide for REA. I believe we should provide generously for education. I believe we should take care of our veterans in a much better way than we are now doing. In short, I believe we ought to take a survey of what is needed in the United States before we send any money across the water, no matter to what country we expect to send it. No such survey has been made. We look in vain through the record which has been made as to what amount of money is needed to take care of our own people. Our

aged are still hungry, cold, and unclothed. Money is apparently being shoveled out with a scoop shovel to everyone who has time to board an airplane and fly to this country and request it.

So, Mr. President, I regret that I cannot go along with the unanimous report of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I simply find it impossible to do so. I think as time goes on my vote against the Marshall plan will be justified, just as today my vote against the United Nations Charter is justified.

PROPOSED ANTILYNCHING LEGISLATION

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I offer several amendments to Senate bill 42, the antilynching bill, to be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for consideration by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the first amendment provides that whenever there has been committed a crime which is a felony according to the laws of the State where committed, and a State officer neglects or refuses to make diligent efforts to solve it, he shall be convicted of a felony, and, upon conviction, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$5,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding 5 years, or both.

The first amendment also provides that every governmental subdivision of a State to which the State shall have delegated police functions shall be civilly liable for any crime which is a felony according to the laws of that State, which occurs within its territorial jurisdiction, and which remains unsolved for a period of longer than 3 years, in every case in which any officer or officers of that governmental subdivision charged with the duty, or possessing the authority, to solve such crime, neglects or refuses to make diligent efforts to do so. The amendment further gives a person injured because of the State officer's neglect or refusal a cause of action for damages against the county or municipality in a sum not less than \$2,000 or more than \$10,000.

In other words, Mr. President, the amendment seeks to broaden the antilynching bill, which merely provides a civil liability against a county when a person is lynched within the county. The bill applies only to lynching. That is a hollow, useless, worthless attempt to get votes from a certain minority in this country, and does not seek to give Federal protection to the people of the United States which its authors claim it will do.

Mr. President, there is only one-thirtieth of 1 percent as many lynchings in this country as there are murders. The statistics show that in 1900 there were 115 lynchings; in 1910 there were 76; in 1920 there were 61; in 1930 there were 21; in 1940 there were 5; in 1944 there were 2; in 1945 there was only 1 lynching; in 1946 there were 6 lynchings; and in 1947 there was only 1 lynching.

There are practically no lynchings in this country, yet the Congress, at the darkest hour in the history of our country, is asked to take up days and weeks in

an attempt to influence the votes of a minority group in the coming election by action on such a measure as the antilynching bill.

The bill does not seek really to give protection to the people involved. What are the facts? In 1946, in the country as a whole, there were 8,444 cases of murder and manslaughter, 12,117 women were raped, there were 62,782 cases of robbery, there were 229,920 automobile thefts, there were 357,991 burglary cases, there were 941,738 larceny cases.

Much of the agitation for a Federal antilynching act comes from the city of New York, and in that city in 1946, 325 murders, 14,525 lesser felonies, and a total of 698 other crimes were committed in that one city. These figures are for one city, and for 1 year. In the entire United States in 1946, with 140,000,000 people, there were only 6 lynchings. Yet, no cry comes to us to give the people of the city of New York adequate police protection.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an editorial which appeared in the New York World-Telegram of February 16, about conditions in the city of New York, which quotes the Allen Keller crime report. Let me read what it says describing one area in the city of New York. It describes back yards piled high with garbage, and also an area so infested with drunks, marijuana smokers, brawlers, hold-up men, and insulters of women that decent citizens, and even the police, deliberately avoided it. The paper asks, "Why should the police shun an area where they are most needed?"

Mr. President, my amendment would give to a person in the city of New York, where police protection in areas has broken down, who is injured as a result of their negligence or of their malfeasance, the right to sue for damages against the city of New York, and it would make a police officer there who neglects or fails to do his duty criminally liable, as is attempted in the antilynching bill. The theory underlying the two measures is the same.

It is said that police protection in the South has broken down, and therefore that Federal action is necessary, but here is a crime report for the city of New York and a great paper says editorially that in a certain area of the city there is no police protection because police do not go into that area. If we are to have a person injured because the police refuse or fail to act, or fail to exercise due diligence, when a lynching is committed, a person who is robbed, or maimed, or the relatives of one who is killed, in the city of New York, or in any other great city in this country, should also have the right to sue for damages against the municipality or against the county in which it is located. The amendment is submitted to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary for its consideration.

Mr. President, there is another amendment, which I shall read. On page 2, line 11, after the word "thereof", I propose to insert the following: "And any unlawful violence of one or more persons, including but not limited to members of a group of lawbreakers such as

are commonly designated as gangsters or racketeers, which results in murder or any other felony."

Last year there was one lynching in the United States, there were six the year before, there was one the year before that, and at the same time there were dozens of gang murders. Yet gentlemen come here and say, "Let us pass an antilynching bill," and are sure to have that bill so worded that it will not give the people of Chicago, or the people of New York, or of any other great metropolitan area, Federal protection against gang killings. The killings in Chicago during the Capone era caused shame all over the world.

Mr. President, the Capone organization, if reports are true, controlled the police department. It was a supergovernment of criminals by which men by the score were murdered, and no convictions for those murders were returned because the police conspired with the Capone gang.

A few nights ago I read the story of the Berger gang in southern Illinois. Forty men were murdered by that gang. Not a single conviction was returned in the courts of Illinois against the gang. That gang even possessed tanks and machine guns and cannon and airplanes with which to commit murder. It had a hired army. The gang even had a fort, and one of its hired armies attacked another which was entrenched behind the fort. Nothing was done by the Illinois authorities about it. The police officers were controlled by the gang, and refused to give to the public of that area protection.

Mr. President, if by law, such as the law proposed by some with respect to lynching, we are going to have Federal action, why should not people who are in danger of being murdered by criminal gangs be protected by the authorities? When the police do not do their duty why should not the heirs of a person killed have the right to a civil suit for damages in the Federal court, and why should not the police officer who is owned by the gang, who fails and refuses to do his duty, be liable for criminal damages in the Federal court?

It is shocking to public decency that the greatest gangster of all time, Mr. Al Capone, the greatest murderer in the history of this country, was never convicted in the courts of Illinois for crime, but was merely convicted for income-tax violation by the Federal court under action brought by the United States Government.

I have another amendment which provides that the heirs of a man who is killed and injured during a race riot—and such a crime is certainly caused by reason of race feelings—if the police fail to do their duty, a civil suit for damages shall lie just as is provided in a case of lynching.

Mr. President, what are the figures with respect to such crimes? In 1943, in the city of Detroit, there were 35 persons killed in one race riot. Think of it. More persons were killed in 1 day in the city of Detroit in 1943 than have been lynched in the United States in the past 20 years. Oh, no, we do not

cover such cases in the bill. Of the 35 persons who were killed, 28 were colored and 7 were white. The official figures show that there were 700 persons injured in that riot. There the police failed to do their duty. I have seen pictures of Negroes injured in the riot, one of a bloody Negro on the ground being beaten by white men, while police stood there and refused to interfere.

I hold in my hand a Detroit newspaper, the Detroit Tribune, dated Saturday, June 26, 1943, from which I should like to read a few lines. It gives a report of the conduct of the police in that riot. A man was pulled off a streetcar and attacked by a mob. This statement appears in the newspaper:

Izzard stated that two white policemen stood there and saw the crowd of men, women, and children stoning him, but did not raise a hand to prevent it.

Again in the Saturday, July 3, issue of the same newspaper there is, under the heading of Comments, the following:

Civil Rights Federation: "Many Detroit policemen not only refused protection to colored people, but actually participated in and aided and abetted the mob violence against Negroes."

Mr. President, in the month of August that year, in the Harlem section of New York City, there was a race riot. No one knows how many people were killed in the various race riots which have occurred, but in Harlem the lowest figure of dead was placed at five Negroes. The lowest figure of persons injured was 500, and the property damage was assessed at \$5,000,000.

Why in the name of reason, Mr. President, when police fail to do their duty in Harlem and in Detroit, should they not be criminally liable? There was the crime caused by race feeling. If Congress is going to say that in respect to lynchings the county shall be liable, why does not the same reasoning apply to the cases I have cited, and why should not the cities of New York and Detroit be held liable in damages, as it is proposed to hold liable for civil damages counties in which a lynching occurs?

Mr. President, I read a few days ago a very able discussion of the antilynching bill. But before I come to that I wish to say that there are two additional amendments which I shall present, one of which provides, after the word "persons", to insert the following: "or which interferes with, or presents, or attempts to present by physical violence, occurring during the course of picketing or boycotting or in connection with any 'labor dispute' as that term is defined and used in the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, or otherwise, and without authority of law, the employment, or the right of any citizen or citizens, person or persons, to work."

Some say a man is denied his civil rights to a trial when he is lynched; therefore it is proposed to pass the antilynching bill. By the same reasoning a man is denied his God-given right to work under certain circumstances. I submit that when police connive, where the police refuse to take action on a picket line, the county or city in which that occurs should be held liable in dam-

ages, if Congress is going to place liability against counties in which lynchings occur. Also the officers who refuse to do their duty in such cases should be liable criminally.

Mr. President, I think it is a sad condition when our country is on the brink of war, when the war clouds become more menacing, that the Congress of the United States should be called upon to drop all consideration of great questions and take off after an antilynching bill, in order to secure some votes in the election this fall. That is especially true when the facts show that the crime of lynching has disappeared in the United States.

Mr. President, we saw in the newspapers an announcement by the President of the United States made on yesterday. I have no comment to make about the two men who announced the candidacy, but I say that what the people of this country want more than anything else is a man who can unite America in the face of a common foe, a man who is bigger than partisanship, a man who will not cater to groups in order to get votes, but who will protect the Constitution of the United States, who will protect the liberties of the people of the country, who will protect the sovereignty of the States, and who will not sacrifice the national interest for political gain in behalf of organized pressure groups. The people of the country want a candidate for President who will be fair to all groups and conduct the affairs of the country for the benefit of its people.

I think both political parties would do well to drop this movement which creates hatred, strife, and discord in America. We have more sectional feeling in this country today than we have had at any time since the reconstruction era. We have class hatred; we have racial prejudices; and we have politicians fishing in the troubled waters to get votes. I think our domestic scene today is at the all-time low. The people of the country want a leader to conduct the affairs of the country for the welfare of its citizens.

In the primary in the State of New Hampshire there are two candidates for the Republican nomination. They are both good men. I am not a Republican; but, Mr. President, the people of this country want neither of those men to lead them for the next 4 years. They want a man who will rise above party, who will rise above petty matters, who will not sacrifice the national interest to appease pressure groups on each side. When we find such a man he should be nominated by both political parties to lead this country in the face of a common foe, and to take a stand for decency against further aggression from the Soviet Union.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments submitted by the Senator from Mississippi will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it appears that it is necessary to act upon certain military nominations at this time. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that,

as in executive session, the Senate proceed to the consideration of such nominations, which will be presented by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]; and I ask that the Chair recognize the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably certain routine nominations sent to the Senate by the President and carefully considered by the committee. They are reported unanimously. They total in number 1,791 officers, all in the grades below that of general. I present Executive nominations M, N, O, 101, 102, 103, and 113 and ask unanimous consent for their immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none.

Without objection, the nominations are confirmed, as in executive session.

Mr. GURNEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE AND AID TO THE BLIND

Mr. HILL obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] would like to introduce a bill. He has a statement to make, which I am informed will require about half a minute. I ask unanimous consent that he be recognized at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have consistently objected earlier in the day to such requests. I should like to comply with the request of the distinguished Senator, because I have great admiration for him. How long will the statement require? Will it require more than half a minute?

Mr. ELLENDER. It will require about that length of time.

Mr. HILL. Under the circumstances, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Louisiana without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, if the privilege is abused, the rule will be invoked.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I would have been through by this time.

Out of order, I send to the desk a bill for appropriate reference. The bill is to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to increase the amount of Federal contributions to the States for old-age assistance and aid to the blind.

Under existing laws the Federal share with respect to each individual receiving old-age assistance amounts to \$10 for the first \$5 spent by the State, plus \$1 for each additional dollar spent by the State, up to \$15. Under the present law it would be possible for the beneficiaries of old-age assistance to receive a total

of \$45. The purpose of this amendment is to increase the Federal Government's share \$5. That is, the Federal share would be \$15 for the first \$5 of State money, plus \$1 for each additional \$1 spent by the State, up to \$15. In other words, should this amendment be adopted, it would be possible for each State to contribute, with what it receives from the Federal Government, up to \$50 for each aged person entitled to it, \$30 of which would be made available by the Federal Government and \$20 by the State.

Under existing law the rate of the Federal contribution in the case of aid to the blind is the same as the rate for old-age assistance. The amendment makes a change in this rate corresponding to the change in the old-age contribution rate.

Since Federal contributions are made on a quarterly basis, the amendments are made effective as of April 1, 1948, the beginning of the next calendar quarter.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2283) to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to increase the amounts of Federal contributions to the States for old-age assistance and aid to the blind, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2202) to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if there is one thing of which I am certain as I stand here today, it is that the people of the world desperately want peace. The suffering nations are weary and sick of war. And yet, the world is being pushed toward war by a gigantic conspiracy—dictated from Soviet Russia—against order and security and freedom for mankind.

Any lingering doubts about Russia's lust for world domination have now been swept away—in the pitiful story of Czechoslovakia—in the pressure on Finland—in the glowing tension in France and the immediate threat in Italy—in the brazen and arrogant words of Foreign Minister Molotov warning other sovereign states against participation in the Marshall plan:

The Soviet Government considers it necessary to caution the Governments of Great Britain and France against the consequences of such action.

Mr. President, the pattern is clear. In the 2 years since the end of the Second World War, every act by Soviet Russia has been an act of calculated aggression, of greed for power and ambition for new domain. Where Moscow's aims are best suited by delay, efforts to build the peace have met with obstruction. Now when swift action advances the Russian plan, the world sees ruthless and instant resort

to the most despicable methods of Adolf Hitler.

Through a coldly planned program of infiltration and subversion, power politics and military pressure, Russia has created a network of puppet states across Europe—Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania, and Czechoslovakia. Finland is next, and the Scandinavian nations are trembling. France girds herself for a new Communist-led general strike; and in Italy, Premier de Gasperi warns that if the Communists are not defeated in the general elections, the iron curtain will fall.

Russia has blocked the peace terms for Germany through the device of exorbitant reparations demands and has willfully prevented the restoration of German industrial production so necessary to European recovery. In Korea, Russia has abandoned all pretense of seeking agreement and strengthens Korean communism for the day when American and Soviet occupation troops will depart.

Russia has issued orders to all Communists—wherever they may be—to wreck the Marshall plan because it holds forth the promise of food and economic restoration, security, and political independence to the people of western Europe. Russia desires hunger and poverty, division and confusion, among these people so that they may finally feel forced to trade freedom for bread—that they may provide fertile soil for communism.

With force and fear ruling so much of the world, I know well that America must maintain her military strength. Throughout the recent war, in serving on the Senate Military Affairs Committee, I had impressed upon me day after day the necessity for thinking and planning and acting ahead. I take pride in the part I have played in trying to help to keep America's ramparts guarded. But as one who has for many years shared responsibility for our Nation's military preparedness, let me say that American security cannot rest upon arms alone, no matter how strong our weapons.

We are in a new age of science, of warfare, and of world relationships. We cannot escape the realities of this world—of the jet plane, the guided missile, and the atomic bomb. Our Nation cannot live unto itself alone, no matter how much we might desire to do so. When the knell of freedom sounds for any nation, we need not ask for whom the bell tolls. The death of freedom and democracy anywhere in the world threatens freedom and democracy in America.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend the Senator from Mississippi for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Alabama has mentioned the possibility that the Marshall plan might fail. What does the Senator think would be the result in the United States if the plan failed?

Mr. HILL. I shall come to that point in a moment, if the Senator will permit me to proceed at this time.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to hear the Senator's discussion of that point. He is making a very able argument.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, no man in America has given more of his thoughts or of himself to the building of peace than has Cordell Hull. Last Saturday, in the final chapter of his memoirs, he declared:

The American people, Congress, and the Executive must keep sharp watch lest the United States return again to the dangerous policy of isolation. Two major wars within a generation should have convinced all Americans that we are an important part of the world, that conflict abroad cannot but affect us, and that our welfare, peace, and security are tied to those of other nations. We have responsibility for leadership and cooperation which we cannot avoid, if we would.

We cannot know for certain that the Marshall plan will succeed. But we do know that if we would remain a great and free nation we must recognize that we live in the new age and we must make use of all our strength and all our powers. We must learn to exercise our great economic strength, for economic weapons are often more powerful and more effective than military weapons. Through our economic strength, we may forestall military conflict and win the victory without the back-breaking toil, the appalling waste in treasured resources, and the dreadful toll of lives which war makes inevitable for both victor and vanquished. The Marshall plan is such an undertaking.

Through economic aid, the United States helps to restore and rebuild the exhausted democracies of Europe. In the language of the act itself, we help to "sustain and strengthen principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence through assistance to those countries of Europe who participate in a joint recovery program based on self-help and mutual cooperation."

When we give the European democracies the aid they must have, we help them to move from weakness to strength, from doubt to self-reliance, and from fear to independence. We help freedom-loving men in western Europe to stand firm and resolute, holding the frontiers of democracy for us, as well as for themselves.

In restoring the productivity and economic strength of western Europe, the Marshall plan will lighten our own staggering burden of armament. The democratic nations will become active and helpful partners in preserving the peace.

Inadequate American aid would leave the European democracies easy marks for Communist infiltration and domination. America's armament burdens would heavily increase, and we would find ourselves more and more encircled by totalitarian enemies of democracy.

Last year the United States spent more than \$10,000,000,000 on its armed forces. If the westward tide of Russian expansion is not checked, this will soon be inadequate to provide security. Secretary of National Defense Forrestal testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that unless there could be reasonable hope for the stabilization of western Europe, the military services would be compelled to ask many billions more for military security.

The increase in military expenditures would be only a part of the price. Life in an armed camp would mean lowering

our standard of living. More than this, it would mean regimentation of our economic and political life; the loss of many of our freedoms. And in the face of steadily mounting tension and competitive armament, the final explosion of war would come.

Even without war, the failure to help rebuild western Europe would see our domestic economy cut off from the foreign markets we must have.

Foreign trade is essential to a vigorous and expanding American economy. Foreign trade is essential to a strong and free America. The Marshall plan will help to restore the profitable markets which a thriving western Europe with its 270,000,000 people and its industrial economy, second only to that of America, can provide for our agricultural commodities—cotton, lumber, peanut oils, naval stores, tobacco—and for our manufactured products—machine tools, farm equipment, automobiles, and other mass-production goods.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator has spoken of the loss of those markets. Of course, if Russia takes over western Europe, we shall have permanently lost those markets. But does the Senator think for one moment that if we permanently lose our historic markets in western Europe, we shall be able to maintain the private-enterprise system in the United States?

Mr. HILL. I do not think so. I support the Marshall plan for the same reason that I supported the repeal of the arms embargo, the repeal of the Neutrality Act, the enactment of lend-lease, and the passage of the selective service bill. I felt if we permitted totalitarian aggression by Hitler and the Japanese war lords to encircle us we could not maintain our free American domestic economy and preserve our free-enterprise system. I feel the same way today about Russian totalitarianism.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend.

Mr. EASTLAND. The point is that if we were to lose permanently those markets, it would be followed, first, by Government control of business in this country. The Senator has spoken of the cotton business. If those markets for American raw cotton were to be permanently lost to us, the United States would have to begin with drastic acreage control and a subsidy program much greater than that ever undertaken before. There would be Government control of every farmer in this country who is engaged in the production of cotton. That is true of other lines of business. There would first be Government control, and then American industry could not profitably operate with the loss of those markets, as it cannot profitably operate unless it can run at capacity or near capacity. Foreign markets are essential to that. Within a period of a few years we would be driven to some form of socialism in this country. So when we support this program and follow it by armed force if necessary, we are saving

the capitalistic system in the United States, because Russia knows that she could destroy our economy and our system without firing a shot simply by refusing to do business with us.

Mr. HILL. I thoroughly agree with the Senator. It is exactly what I sought to say, though the Senator has said it better and in more detail, when I spoke of the fact that if we permitted the western democracies to go down and if we lost our trade, we would be forced into such a system of governmental regimentation that we would lose many of our freedoms, and, to a greater or lesser degree, we would ourselves be forced into some form of totalitarian government. We strive today to prevent war, to preserve and build the peace and also to maintain our free private-enterprise system. Exports mean profitable business for American industry and American shipping. They mean jobs for American workers. In many American industries between 10 and 20 percent of the jobs are dependent upon the maintenance of foreign trade.

Foreign trade provides a strong support for agricultural production and prices. Last year this country sold abroad more than three and a quarter billion dollars' worth of agricultural commodities. Of these farm exports, more than \$2,000,000,000 worth—about 65 percent—were exported to the Marshall plan countries. To lose these foreign markets would mean a sharp reduction in income for farm families, particularly in the South.

The United States normally exports nearly half of its cotton crop each year and some 57 percent of this cotton has gone into the countries which will share in the Marshall plan. Without foreign markets for several million bales a year, cotton producers will have to depend on domestic consumption. This means that huge cotton surpluses will accumulate and drive prices down. The purchasing power of the Cotton South will be sorely hit.

The Marshall plan offers the best and most immediate chance we have today for peace and reconstruction in a war-torn world. It is worth the wholehearted support and cooperation of all the people of the United States.

Europe has responded with vigorous action to the Marshall plan. The 16 Marshall-plan countries have pledged—and are now achieving—increased production, growing financial and economic stability, and joint steps to expand trade.

But the nations of western Europe wisely recognize that if their recovery is to be made permanent—they must go on to some more creative enterprise than simply restoring their individual economies through the Marshall plan.

The same old Europe, divided by illogical tariff walls and torn by jealousies, will not bring permanent recovery and permanent peace. To preserve this crazy quilt is to perpetuate the irresistible economic pressures and political differences which twice in the last 25 years have exploded into war.

Europe can make its full contribution to world production and world peace only by fitting the jigsaw puzzle of European states into some reasonable pattern of

unity and cooperation. The people of Europe must pool their assets and join together in their productive efforts. They must have access to electric power, fuel, navigation, transportation, and communication free from artificial restraints and artificial barriers.

In the past European unity has been ignored or thrust aside by short-sighted jealousies, power politics, and the dead hand of tradition.

Now new compulsions drive the peace-loving nations toward unity. Prime Minister Attlee of Great Britain has said: "Europe must federate or perish."

At this moment five nations—Britain, France, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg—are preparing to sign a 50-year agreement which can lay the basis for the economic and military union of western Europe.

The agreement goes far beyond old-fashioned military alliance and provides for joint action upon common economic, political, and military problems. The new agreement follows the way pointed by the existing customs union of Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg.

Italy may be brought into the pact if democratic government is maintained in the approaching Italian elections.

The federation is committed to western ideas of democracy and freedom which no totalitarian nation could accept. But the door should not be closed to those nations now dominated by Russia. Two of those nations showed their desire to participate in the Marshall plan before Moscow forbade them to take part. Eastern Europe needs the manufactured products of western Europe, which in turn needs the raw materials and agricultural commodities of the east. We may find, as western Europe is restored to productivity under the Marshall plan, that the natural pressures for trade and commerce will be stronger than the iron curtain of communism.

The idea of a united Europe is not new. It has been the goal of enlightened men since the Middle Ages. It was the great design of Henry IV of France in the seventeenth century. Victor Hugo pleaded for union at the International Peace Congress in 1849. After the First World War, Aristide Briand, of France, and Gustav Stresemann, the German democratic leader, tried in vain to implant this vision in the minds of the treaty makers.

I urged a year ago that the nations of Europe strive for a real and effective federation.

Through the Marshall plan we may hope that the United States—out of her experience and her rich heritage of union—can give inspiration and encouragement to Europe's efforts to achieve economic and political federation.

We may hope that in the very rubble and ashes of Europe today there shall be laid the foundations for the structure of a new, united, and strong Europe which in the years to come will play its part in guaranteeing peace and security for the world.

There are those who claim that the Marshall plan will impoverish the United States and sap her resources. There are others who would reduce the funds for

the program and make the Marshall plan into a gigantic and costly relief program.

But it is my judgment that we have done all that it is humanly possible to do in charting our course. We have calculated the risks and explored the alternatives. There is ample evidence that we are not underwriting a bankrupt Europe, nor exhausting America.

The foundation of the Marshall plan is the report by the independent civilian committee with Secretary of Commerce Harriman as chairman. The members of this committee in their experience and their outlook represent the varied tapestry that is the American economy—business and industry, agriculture, labor, and government. They include former Senator Robert M. La Follette; Owen D. Young; Paul Hoffman, of the Committee for Economic Development; Chester C. Davis, wartime Food Administrator, farm expert, and banker; William I. Myers, dean, College of Agriculture of Cornell University; Edward S. Mason, of Harvard University; George Meany, of the American Federation of Labor; James B. Carey, of the Congress of Industrial Organizations; and others known and respected throughout America.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Senator from Alabama on his reference to and discussion of the unification of Europe. I am thoroughly in accord with his views on that question, but I should like to ask him if he does not believe that unless some commitment of a fairly definite nature is made toward political union at this time, the result of the Marshall plan, assuming that it rehabilitates Europe economically to some extent, will be to prevent or to remove the necessity for political union? That is what bothers me.

Mr. HILL. I will say to my friend from Arkansas that I should like to see such a commitment, but I must also frankly say, after having heard the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations speak on this matter a few days ago, I doubt the wisdom of attempting to write into the legislation which is now before the Senate a requirement that the beneficiary nations shall make such a commitment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator will further yield, that question was settled yesterday as to this particular measure. What I have in mind is the question of unification, which is not yet settled. According to this morning's newspapers, it does not seem that the powers gathered in Brussels are considering political unification. It seems to be a question of alliance, with which we have been familiar for many years. Alliances never have any lasting value so far as promoting unification is concerned.

Mr. HILL. Of course, we do not know what is being agreed on or what has been agreed on, if there has been any final agreement. Until we have that information we cannot know just what the situation is as a result of the conference; but from what I have seen in the

press—and I have in mind particularly an article which appeared on the front page of the Sunday morning Washington Post—there is great encouragement to believe that the agreement will go much further than alliances such as we have known in the past. The agreement will go not only to the question of an economic federation, with certain limitations, of course, but there will be definite political aspects to the agreement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not at all clear about it. I know of no case in which economic federations have ever been permanent or successful.

Mr. HILL. I look forward to some form of political federation. I think there is an economic federation now. Surely, if we want it to last we must move to the next step, which is some form of political federation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The idea that a customs union or an economic federation means anything is confusing. If I understand the Senator rightly, he does not feel it is significant except as a step.

Mr. HILL. I think it is significant as a step. I do not think it is the final step which should be taken, but I think it is a very wholesome and encouraging beginning.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator know of any analogous cases in history in which there has been an economic federation among any sovereign states which has resulted in permanency?

Mr. HILL. My distinguished friend, who is the former chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. CONNALLY], and a man of great erudition and knowledge of history, suggests the Hanseatic League.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What happened to that league?

Mr. CONNALLY. It lasted a long while. It was very effective, but it finally dissolved.

Mr. HILL. No federation has lasted all through the centuries. It is an interesting thing to note that one of the oldest governments in the world today is our American Government.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I never understood that it was an economic federation.

Mr. HILL. It is basically a political federation, with a strong tying together of our economy. It is tied in to one mighty network, economically as well as politically. Our Government is about the oldest political federation in the world today.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not want to interrupt the Senator from Arkansas if he wishes to go ahead.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is talking about political federations. Of those which have been created in modern times the most substantial ones are Canada and the Union of South Africa. The Senator does not leave in my mind an impression that they are not a healthy form of government.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is entirely incorrect if he has any idea that I do

not think they are healthy, stable governments. They certainly are. But the Senator was talking about history.—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let us consider the Hanseatic League. That was certainly a very loose league of relatively small towns which were spotted all over Europe. The league did not result in any political organization which came to life at all.

Mr. HILL. I think the Senator is bound to agree that our Federal Union grew out of basic economic needs and economic compulsion. Problems of waterways, roads, commerce, and trade between the States compelled and brought about the formation of the political union which is the Government of the United States.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Has not the Senator really made an argument for the federal unions of which he has been talking?

In other words, the American Union is a success because it is a combination of States economically, politically, and militarily which fact has given them, as the Senator has pointed out, greater strength than that possessed by any other union in history.

I am moved to observe, in view of the remarks of the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Arkansas, that the political unions about which they talk are really nothing but political alliances. History is strewn with the wreckage of alliances between sovereign states, and I suppose that so long as history continues alliances will be made and broken. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that, reading some recent history of the Locarno Pact, France and England both pledged each other that they would come to one another's assistance, and the demilitarized status of the Rhineland was to be preserved. English public opinion was not ready to back up the Government, and the Government did not have any stamina, anyway, and it ran out on the French Government, and broke the alliance. I merely offer that as a comment on the validity and strength of alliances between sovereign states.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator for his helpful contribution.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree with what the Senator observed a moment ago about the inadvisability of including in the bill any suggestion or anything in the way of persuasion or compulsion. I think that would be most unfortunate. If the peoples of Europe want to form a union on their own, and make a start, as they are now doing in conferences they are holding, it may grow into something with which the United States can deal. But I suggest that if the recipient countries live up to their obligations under the pending bill they will be brought more nearly in contact with each other than they have ever been, economically, at least. I think that will contribute

very mightily to probably a future political arrangement or union of some character.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator know of anything which contributes more to political union than economic necessities and economic compulsions?

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree with what the Senator said a little while ago, that most political action, after all, has its roots in some economic situation.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Even the Revolutionary War had a little something to do with a tea party in Boston, and a stamp act in Virginia, and things of that kind, which perhaps were not primary causes, but they contributed to a political revolution.

Mr. HILL. Surely our Union grew out of such things.

Mr. CONNALLY. What happened about the Federal Union? It was controversy between New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and New York over the navigation rights on the Hudson River. It was difficulty between Virginia and Maryland over the fishing rights in the Chesapeake Bay. The first meeting which eventually resulted in the calling of a Constitutional Convention was held at Alexandria, in the old Carlisle House, because Virginia and Maryland were quarreling over the use of the Potomac River and the Chesapeake Bay with regard to fishing and navigation, and kindred matters, economic things. That convention was then adjourned to Annapolis, where it was very sparsely attended. Then it adjourned to Philadelphia, and the Constitution of the United States was the result. So it is not possible to dissociate economics from political actions, because many times union has its roots in some economic quarrel or disagreement.

If under the pending bill the countries to be benefited are able to work in harmony, and are brought more closely together, and see the mutual advantages to accrue to each of them from the action of the others, it may germinate, it may initiate, it may stimulate some political union in the years to come. I just drop that as a suggestion.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has made a very fine contribution, because certainly economic federation, to say the very least, makes fertile soil for political federation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Those who have prevented the inclusion in the bill of anything that looks like any more coercion than what is already in it, even relative to a laudable purpose like the unity of the European nations, were very wise in what they did. If the people of Europe desire, in the face of necessity or adversity, to form their own union, as we did, in a situation which seems to demand such unity, then well and good, but a union imposed upon Europe by the financial power of the United States would hardly last longer than the unions which military conquerors have imposed by force of arms in periods past.

I should like to submit one reservation about the thought of European union in a formal sense. I have the feeling that when we talk about building up new entities and new unities in the world, it is at the expense of the whole universal unity which we hope to achieve through the United Nations organization. Probably the very fact that we are facing this problem today as we are, the very fact that there is so much talk of this kind of union, arises from the fact that the United Nations, which we thought would be a union of all people, has fallen into a period of decline, which is temporary, I hope. But I have a feeling that it would be better to build a magnificent edifice where there would be room for all, than to decentralize the international organization, as it were, into mere regional organizations. It is my fervent hope that we are going to find some way to reconstruct an effective international organization, with its functioning social and economic council, which will keep something like what we are now dealing with going on all the time.

In fact, just western Europe working together, or working with the United States, is not the answer even to their or our economic problem. Neither of us can exist prosperous without access to the other trade markets and peoples and resources of the world. We would all have to suffer a very serious decline in our level of living if we were cut off from access to the rest of mankind, if we were torn out of the world economy.

So when we are talking about what might be a laudable thing, if these people desire to undertake it, I hope we will not lose sight of the fact that we hope to have some time an international organization in which every nation and every people will have a harmonious home, and where international working together on economic matters, and matters of security, will not only preserve prosperity, but peace for the whole race of man.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree with much the Senator from Florida has said; but, on the other hand, there is another consideration to be thought of. Many of these nations are little nations; they are powerless, on their own, to resist either armed intervention or economic infiltration, and from that aspect—and I am not suggesting it, I think they should decide it themselves—it might be very desirable, if they could, to form little groups of somewhat identical interests, to aid them and to sustain them and to give them strength in hours of peril. That is what is happening today. In the east, Russia, with its tremendous prestige and power and influence, has gathered about itself many satellite nations. They are small. They could not resist. I think some of them would have resisted if they had been able to. Take the case of Czechoslovakia. Czechoslovakia has had a very glorious history. It has been a country of democracy. It has had splendid ideals. It will be remembered that John Huss lived away back in the fif-

teenth century—a hundred years ahead of Martin Luther. So the Czechoslovaks for centuries have been that kind of people.

What could they do under the circumstances which existed? Before a great country like Russia, with the Red Army with banners waving and bayonets glistening, Czechoslovakia had to collapse, notwithstanding the fact that in the last elections that were held it was indicated that the people were not in favor of totalitarianism, were not in favor of communism. From that standpoint, a league of a number of small nations, which might give to each other strength and stability and stamina—if I might use that word—might be a desirable thing. But after all, I do not withdraw my other statement that they must want to do it, and they must begin the movement before the United States can afford definitely and directly to suggest it, especially in connection with a finance bill; and many propaganda agents would begin to pump out the material that it was a scheme to bribe them into doing it, or to coerce them under the pressure of economic need.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it seems to me that everything that could be said for a union of the countries of Europe applies to the union of all the countries of the world. The way to keep aggression down is for an international force effectively to resist it, and protect those who are the victims.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida does not more fervently wish this magnificent structure of union for all the peoples and all the nations than I do. But as I see the situation, we sought to build that structure with the United Nations. We have, at least for the present, been stalemated in that work. Unable to build at this moment that great over-all structure for all nations, and for all peoples, we turn to building the structure section by section, hoping that we may finally arrive at the magnificent building for all the peoples and all the nations. If we can build this federation in Western Europe, it will simply be one section that we have built to fit into, to be a part of, this great over-all structure for all the nations and all the peoples.

Mr. President, the Department of the Interior surveyed the Nation's natural resources and reported that American productive capacity was ample to carry out the plan. The President's Council of Economic Advisers reported favorably on the strength of the American economy to meet the impact of European aid. Exhaustive studies were made by the executive departments.

The 16 nations of western Europe participating in the Marshall plan have submitted extensive data on their resources and needs, on the help they can give themselves, and the help they must have from the United States.

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs held extensive hearings, giv-

ing witnesses of every opinion the opportunity to record their views.

Secretary of State Marshall declared that the funds requested represent the minimum requirements for a successful recovery program. Mr. John J. McCloy, president of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, testified:

The amount recommended is conservative. Far from being extravagant, it provides a rather tight fit.

Under the astute and statesmanlike guidance of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the bill has been given the unanimous approval of the committee, obtaining the concurrence of both Democratic and Republican Members representing all shades of thought.

The unanimous conclusion of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was that the program outlined and the funds requested cannot be revised or reduced without serious danger to the objective of the program—the rebuilding of a western Europe that can pay its own way in the world and play its part in preventing war and building the peace of the world.

From over the Nation as a whole, support of the Marshall plan and its objectives is practically universal. Approval has come from business, labor and agriculture, teachers, churchmen, youth organizations, and women's groups—the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Farmers Union, the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Junior Chamber of Commerce, the League of Women Voters, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National Federation of Business and Professional Women, the National Intercollegiate Christian Council; veterans' organizations, such as the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the AMVETS, and many other organizations representative of America.

The final verdict, after the most thorough bipartisan scrutiny, may be summed up in these words from the report of the independent Harriman committee:

The committee is convinced that a sound program for western European recovery should be formulated and adopted by the United States with the same boldness and determination, and the same confidence in the worthiness of the democratic cause, which characterized our action in World War II.

This is the choice. Now we must move ahead. The essential first step is to assure sufficient funds to give the recovery program a fair trial. We must not skimp or indulge in false economy. Halfway measures will hazard the success of the venture, if not assure its defeat from the very beginning.

Help for the exhausted nations of Europe cannot come through the United Nations. The United Nations is stalemated today by the veto of the very dictator nation which would overpower the countries we seek to help.

We have accepted the fact that America must act independently of the United Nations if the reconstruction program for

Europe is to be carried out. We know that the Russian bloc would defeat the program if they could. We cannot make European recovery subject to the veto of a hostile Russia and her satellites.

But the European recovery program can be carried out by America in association with the United Nations and always in accordance with the spirit and principles of the United Nations.

And finally, as the Marshall plan goes forward, America can bear ever in mind that as the peace-loving and peace-living nations grow in strength and independence—speaking the will of their peoples instead of the echo of ruthless power—the United Nations grows in strength and independence.

For the democracies, where human rights and freedoms are nurtured and cherished, have never been the war makers of this earth. Their strength is the strength of peace.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator spoke in his peroration about the fact that we could not go to the United Nations and hope for success. If I am not mistaken, the Senator from Alabama was a cosponsor of a joint resolution introduced last June or July, calling for changes in the United Nations Charter. Am I correct?

Mr. HILL. No; the Senator from Connecticut is not correct. My distinguished colleague [Mr. SPARKMAN] was one of the cosponsors of that joint resolution, as I recall.

Mr. McMAHON. With due deference to the senior Senator from Alabama, I would say that that was almost as good.

Mr. HILL. I quite agree with my distinguished friend from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the Senator think that we had better be getting to the business of undertaking to see what we can do to make the United Nations effective? If every time there is a crisis we say, "We must do this by ourselves, because the United Nations cannot do it, and it is subject to the veto," then is it not high time that under section 109 of the Charter we invited the nations of the earth in for the purpose of seeing whether the United Nations is to be an effective organization for keeping the peace of the world, or whether we must be reconciled to the fact that all we can get out of it is veto, veto, and veto, and no, no, no, while furnishing an auditorium and an audience before whom people who are doing the best they can to maintain the peace of the world can be called warmongers?

Mr. HILL. I share with the Senator his great desire and eagerness to do all in our power to make strong and effective the United Nations. I certainly believe that the thought which he has thrown out is one which is worthy of the most earnest, thoughtful, and immediate consideration.

Mr. McMAHON. Before this debate is concluded I intend to devote myself to a further exposition of that subject. I had intended to do so as quickly as I could, but I find that I must go to Connecticut to attend the funeral of the Governor of our State, who unfortunately passed away. As soon as I return, I

intend to devote myself to a further exposition of that subject, and to point out that if anyone thinks that we can pass the pending bill and then retire, he is very much mistaken. We need to do many other things, and do them very quickly, or we are not going to insure the maintenance of peace.

Mr. HILL. I quite agree with the Senator that we cannot simply pass this bill and stop. We must continue. We must move forward. I shall await with interest the exploration of the subject which the Senator has projected here today. I am sure that other Senators, like myself, are eager to have the Senator from Connecticut, in his fine and able way, throw any light he can on the subject of what we can do to meet the great desire of our hearts to act now to strengthen, fortify, and make effective the United Nations.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. We must all bear in mind that the United Nations is a new body. As yet we have not had a great deal of experience with it. For myself, I favor the abolition of the veto, except in the one case involving taking up arms or going to war. I think that that is a question which we cannot very well turn over to someone else. We cannot afford to allow someone else to order us to send an army somewhere. But in all other matters I believe that the veto ought to be abolished, and provision should be made for a two-thirds vote, or a majority vote, or whatever is deemed best. But that can only be accomplished either by withdrawing from the United Nations and forming a new organization or working out the problem under the United Nations, in the constitutional methods which have been adopted.

I will say to the Senator from Connecticut that personally I welcome his views and suggestions. There are certain other respects in which the Charter could be improved. I am hoping that as we gain further experience under its operations we shall find where the rough places are, and in the course of time eliminate them. However, I do not believe that we ought to despair. I do not believe that we ought to throw up our hands and surrender.

Mr. HILL. The Senator knows the history of our own Federal Union. We started with the Articles of Confederation. It was a number of years before we finally found what is termed the "more perfect union."

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true. We lived under the Articles of Confederation for 8 or 9 years.

Mr. HILL. For some years we lived under the Articles of Confederation.

Mr. CONNALLY. It was during our experience under the Articles of Confederation that the weaknesses and errors of the Articles of Confederation became apparent. We then saw the necessity for a stronger and greater union, which eventuated in the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. HILL. After we agreed on the Federal Union and the Constitution, we had to agree on the first 10 amendments.

Mr. CONNALLY. We had to take 10 amendments which had been suggested and advanced in the Virginia convention, and with respect to which there had been some tacit agreement among the members that they would support ratification of the Constitution provided the 10 amendments, or their substance, should be afterward adopted. It was Mr. Madison himself, who had been so dominant in the convention, who, as a Member of the House of Representatives in the First Congress, introduced the first 10 amendments and secured their adoption.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, we know that in all the 160 years since the ratification of the Federal Constitution our Government has continued to grow and develop. We have adopted a number of amendments to our Constitution.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I am about to yield the floor.

Mr. TAYLOR. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Texas a question, if the Senator from Alabama will yield for that purpose.

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. If it is an easy question, go ahead.

Mr. TAYLOR. This is an easy question.

The Senator from Texas has just stated that he was in favor of abolishing the veto.

Mr. CONNALLY. Except as to one subject.

Mr. TAYLOR. I should like to ask the Senator this question: If suddenly a number of countries should go Communist—enough to give the Communist bloc a majority of votes in the United Nations, the Security Council, and the Assembly—would the Senator still want to abolish the veto?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is speculation. In the first place, the majority of them are not going Communist. That is speculation on which I do not care to venture an opinion, because the Senator is so much better advised than I am as to what the Communists have in mind.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was not trying to find out what the Communists have in mind. I was trying to find out what the distinguished Senator from Texas has in mind, but inasmuch as he does not care to answer the question—

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say this, if it will be an answer: Even under those circumstances I would probably favor it, because, instead of 15 or 20 Communists, each one with a veto in his pocket on every question, we could whittle them down to the one issue of going to war.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I was very much interested in the comments of the Senator from Texas about the way in which we perfected our Federal Union and how the Bill of Rights became attached to it. I am reminded that we lived under the Articles of Confederation for about 14 years. I believe that the difficulty in the thesis of the Senator arises in the framework of reference, because we have not

that much time in which to solve the problem. Let me say to the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Texas that if I thought we had 14 or 15 years to solve the difficulties which the veto has raised and the difficulties in the operation of the United Nations, I would be the most optimistic and pleased person on the face of the earth. I may be wrongfully filled with the conviction that this world is marching to a crisis in seven-league boots. That crisis is not going to wait for trial and error over a period of years to enable us to devise the mechanics to avoid a third world war.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut is a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and former chairman of the Senate Special Committee on Atomic Energy; and I know that he is impressed with the terrific speed with which events move today. I agree with him in his implication that we must move with all the speed possible in strengthening, fortifying, and making effective the United Nations.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further observation?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. At the time referred to the farthest point on the earth was not 48 hours away by airplane and one-tenth of a second away by radio.

Mr. HILL. I now yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to say one word in connection with the last statement made by the Senator from Alabama. The able Senator opines that we ought to move with speed. That is exactly what we ought to do with the debate upon the Marshall plan.

We apparently are going to extend the debate in the Senate, and so will the Members of the House of Representatives, until finally April 1 will go by and April 15 will pass; but all the time while we are debating in Congress, under our democratic way of life, Stalin is moving with speed.

Mr. HILL. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not wish it understood that I am making any of these remarks as a criticism of the magnificent speech the Senator from Alabama has made today. But when I listen day after day to the statements that are made upon a lot of technicalities and a morass of arithmetic that has little or nothing to do with the great, fundamental principles and objectives which are involved in the Marshall plan, I cannot help but feel that we are losing time, Mr. President, and losing it fast.

I pray and hope that something will stir this Congress to such an extent that by April 1 we shall not only finish our discussion of the question of the passage of the authorization bill in both Houses, but we shall be able to tell our friends in the western European democracies that we have passed the Marshall plan and the appropriations for it. Not only will that give to those who cherish freedom in their breasts the psychological boost they need to have in order to carry on, but it will have a determinative in-

fluence toward dissuading Stalin and his associates from their attempts to expand their movement in the world today.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I share so wholeheartedly the feelings which have been expressed by the Senator from Illinois that I now yield the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, let me state from the seat which I now occupy that I agree entirely with the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Illinois; and I hope that regardless of whether we agree with each other or not, positive action will be taken as quickly as possible.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I propose to address myself briefly to the support of Senate bill 2202, the measure pending before this body.

What are the purposes to which this bill addresses itself? This is not a relief measure. Heaven knows that relief is needed by tens and hundreds of millions of people. Relief is needed by practically every nation which suffered the ravages of war. Other tens and hundreds of millions are chronically in need of relief. Even the thought of them arouses our sympathies. But to carry the relief burden of the world is beyond our powers. Should we try to undertake it, we would pull ourselves down to a point where we could not give the assistance which in times past we have always been glad to bring to populations who were suffering under some serious and special calamity.

Nor does the assistance planned in this bill seek a reward in gratitude. We had best immediately write gratitude off the books as an expected asset in the transactions we are considering. Gratitude in relationships of this sort is a shallow and short-lived sentiment. Only those who are inexperienced in the ways of the world or incurably optimistic expect such a result from the program of assistance which is before us.

It is true that we may properly expect favorable relationships to grow out of this undertaking. They will not arise from the emotions transiently felt by a beneficiary toward a benefactor. There is a chance that we may generate in a large degree those emotions of mutual trust and respect which are the normal result of business transactions which are profitable to both parties to a bargain. This is the usual and proper result of such transactions, and at least to that extent the undertakings contemplated in this bill can accomplish friendly relationships on each side of the ocean. Such feelings are stronger and more durable than gratitude.

This country is not looking for prestige. It has all it can use. It is not looking for power. It has, likewise, all of that it knows how to use.

The hard core of necessity to which this undertaking addresses itself is simply this: Are we willing to entrench ourselves behind a Maginot line or a Great Wall of China here on the North American Continent, and trade or travel in the rest of the world only as permitted by a power stronger than we are? That is the direction in which the world is moving. That is the ultimate fate we are facing. That is the question which

we must answer with a "Yes" or "No." There seem to be those who answer "Yes." I, at least, am not among them; and I doubt whether there are any on this floor who give that answer. Our answer is "No."

This is the harsh materialistic aspect of the problem we are facing, but it is deeply related to our cherished ideals, as well. We believe in the worth of the individual. We believe in the freedom of the individual man. We believe that a government and a society based on those concepts will provide greater material, intellectual, and spiritual blessings than will any other form of government which the mind of man has conceived. Not only do we believe this, but we have proved it.

The prospect we are facing is one in which those ideals are extinguished in country after country after country. The midnight of the human soul rolls on toward us. What shall we do about it?

We all know that there is no surety of success in this proposal for economic cooperation with the 16 nations. We all know that it may be too late. But the chances of success are good. We know that if this undertaking is not sure, the alternative of the extinction of civilization in Europe is as sure as anything human can be.

Mr. President, my plea is for speed in this matter. This is not the first time in the few months I have been a Member of this body that we have been urged on to speed in the passing of legislation of this sort; notably, the Greek and Turkish loan was urged upon us as a sudden crisis. The situation in Palestine is a sudden crisis. Other requests for our action have been based on the appeal to crisis psychology. This case is different. The crisis argument is not one carefully prepared by the administration and suddenly unveiled to us in all of its terrifying possibilities. This is a crisis which we ourselves can see. This is a crisis which the people of this Nation can see. There is a headlong rush to the course of events which all can observe.

There are those in this country who live behind a curtain. It is not an iron curtain. It is a curtain of fog which a certain type of midwestern journalism has drawn around a great area in this Nation. On February 11, I chanced to be in the great capital of the Midwest. On the front page of a local newspaper was a cartoon which showed, in an upper half, a figure representing the beggar nations appealing to Uncle Sam for money, and threatening, if the money was not forthcoming, to throw itself off the cliff into the abyss of communism. The lower half of the cartoon showed Uncle Sam refusing the appeal and walking away without concern, whereupon the European suppliant shudderingly and fearfully crawls away from the edge of that abyss.

Surely, Mr. President, even those who are subjected to this kind of propaganda day by day, week by week, month by month, year after year, must by now realize that the sinister advance of communism is a reality; that it has swallowed up nations like Czechoslovakia, and is swallowing Finland, the majority

of whose people have no stomach for it and are fundamentally freedom loving.

Surely even these mistaught fellow citizens must realize that the cloud of darkness is rolling toward Italy and France. Surely they must realize that their nation and ours is living in a world whose limits are being contracted about us.

Mr. President, this bill represents the acceptance of a calculated but still hopeful risk. Delay will make that hopeful risk hopeless. There is a dead line set. That dead line is April 18, when the Italian Nation holds its elections. That country has made a brave endeavor to meet in letter and in spirit the fundamental requirements on which this bill is based. They have endeavored to stabilize their currency. They are endeavoring to build up their production. They have undertaken to hold conversations with their one-time enemy, the Republic of France, in an endeavor to establish economic and possibly political cooperation.

Within the past few weeks similar conferences for economic and political cooperation have been taking place between other nations of western Europe. They are straining every nerve to qualify themselves for the support and cooperation which this bill provides. We cannot fail them. We must not even loiter by the way.

Mr. President, the slow progress of this bill is a mutual and international calamity. Can we not do something about it? For one thing, we can shorten our speeches. To set such poor example as lies within my power, this is a short speech.

Can we not do more? On the St. Lawrence seaway question, unanimous agreement was reached as to a last day on which amendments could be offered. I am told this was an almost unprecedented action. Does not the seriousness of this situation suggest that the unprecedented precedent is repeated? Can we not therefore and at a date not too much later obtain unanimous consent for a vote? Hour by hour, day by day, April 18 is hurrying toward us. We cannot delay its implacable advance. We must not fail to do our part long before it reaches us.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 408. An act for the relief of Lawson Ashby, and others;

H. R. 431. An act for the relief of the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C.;

H. R. 621. An act for the relief of Vera Frances Elicker;

H. R. 697. An act for the relief of Mrs. Essie N. Fannin, Miss Helen Hicks, Miss Marie Hicks, Miss Frances Fannin, William O. Thompson, and Mrs. W. D. Thompson;

H. R. 993. An act for the relief of the estate of Norman C. Cobb, Naomi R. Cobb, and Garland L. Cobb;

H. R. 1131. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine,

and render judgment upon the claim or claims of Charles L. Baker;

H. R. 1139. An act for the relief of Dr. Gisela Perl (Krausz);

H. R. 1152. An act for the relief of Mrs. Inga Patterson, widow of F. X. Patterson;

H. R. 1298. An act for the relief of Anastasio Panage Ionnatos (known as Anastasio Panage Ionnatos or Tom Panage Yanatos);

H. R. 1654. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Elizabeth Campbell;

H. R. 1864. An act for the relief of Mrs. Raiford D. Smith;

H. R. 1929. An act for the relief of Edwin Osgood Cogan, his wife Helen Olga Cogan, and his daughter Isabel Joan Cogan;

H. R. 2012. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pearl Cole;

H. R. 2268. An act for the relief of Charles E. Crook and B. L. Fielder;

H. R. 2293. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate navigation on the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters," approved February 8, 1895;

H. R. 2373. An act for the relief of Stanley-Yelverton, Inc.;

H. R. 2374. An act for the relief of Nita H. Stanley;

H. R. 3175. An act to add certain public and other lands to the Shasta National Forest, Calif.;

H. R. 3742. An act for the relief of Robert Wilhelm Gerling;

H. R. 3936. An act to authorize the United States Park Police to make arrests within Federal reservations in the environs of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3964. An act for the relief of Thomas D. Sherrard;

H. R. 3973. An act relating to the compensation of Commissioners for the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 4331. An act for the relief of Bertha M. Rogers;

H. R. 4541. An act for the relief of Jesse F. Cannon, Jackson Jones, and the estate of John Halstad;

H. R. 4570. An act for the relief of Howard A. Yeager; and

H. R. 4980. An act relating to the acquisition by the United States of State-owned lands within Glacier National Park, in the State of Montana, and for other purposes.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2202) to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I rise to speak against this so-called European recovery program, more familiarly known as the Marshall plan. I expect this bill to pass. I do not expect to be able to stop its passage. Nevertheless, I do not believe that what I have to say is a rear guard action in a hopeless cause.

This is not part of a strategic retreat, but rather I conceive it to be an advance skirmish for battles yet to come, battles that will be won in an all-out fight against a foreign policy the underlying purpose of which I believe to be the economic domination of as much of this world as we can possibly bring into our sphere of influence by the most extravagant expenditure of billions of dollars and a great show of military strength.

The Senator from Florida asked if I should like a quorum call. I would not.

There is no reason in the world to ask for a quorum call. I shall talk for some time, and I do not want anybody to listen to me unless he wants to listen voluntarily. It is a well-known fact that very few opinions are changed on the floor of the Senate. We talk to the people generally, in the hope of changing their outlook upon matters, and eventually of changing the Congress by changing its composition.

But, Mr. President, I should like to say that those of us who are not on the Foreign Relations Committee are at somewhat of a disadvantage when we are vitally interested in matters of foreign affairs. We have our own committees, upon which we must be in attendance at all times. We then have to try to catch up with the experts who are on other committees. I should like to show the disadvantage under which we labor. Hearings were held upon the pending bill for a good many weeks. The bill was written, a report was prepared, and the evidence compiled. I hold in my hand three bound volumes totalling 1,470 pages. They were placed upon the desks of Senators simultaneously with the distribution of the bill itself, which contains 39 pages, and with the report which contains 69 closely printed pages. It is necessary for us to start from scratch. The debate begins immediately. It is very difficult. I have heard in the Senate today a great deal of criticism of the processes of democracy. It has been said that they should be speeded up. That is all very fine. I am for speed if possible, but it seems to me that in a question of the importance of what we are considering, when there is such a mass of evidence, Senators should have an opportunity to study the matter. After the evidence is compiled and the report distributed, we should have at least a week in which to study the matter before it is brought out on the floor.

I have stated that for a long time I have thought the Marshall plan to be a continuation of our foreign policy, the object of which is to extend economic domination over as much of the world as we possibly can. I want to apologize, Mr. President, for not having been in attendance on the Senate floor to hear more of the debate. I was preparing the talk that I intend to deliver now. Incidentally, it is quite a long talk. I apologize for that; but as the minority leader within the minority, I can say that this will be the only speech delivered by my party on this subject. [Laughter.]

I was saying, Mr. President, that I arrived in the Senate Chamber just in time to hear the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] speak. I have always had a high regard for the Senator from Alabama. He is a liberal. I have conceived him to be a liberal. Coming from the South, that is saying a great deal about a man. He must indeed be courageous. One must be courageous to be a liberal, coming from Idaho, but it requires even greater courage to be a liberal coming from the South.

Certain of the remarks that passed between the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] distressed me greatly. Of course,

they confirmed completely within a very few moments what I have contended right along, that this is a bill for economic exploitation. Let me quote from the colloquy of the Senators:

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator has spoken of the loss of those markets. Of course, if Russia takes over western Europe, we shall have permanently lost those markets. But does the Senator think for one moment that if we permanently lose our historic markets in western Europe we would be able to maintain the private-enterprise system in the United States?

That is one page, and the word "democracy" or the name "United Nations" does not appear. It is merely a matter of markets and private enterprise.

The next page has this to say:

Mr. HILL. I may say to the Senator, I do not; and I may say to the Senator further that I support the Marshall plan for the same reason that I supported the repeal of the arms embargo, the repeal of the Neutrality Act, the enactment of lend-lease, and the passage of the selective service bill. I felt that if we permitted totalitarian aggression on the part of Hitler and the Japanese war lords we could not maintain our free American domestic economy—

Nothing about our democratic way of life.

We could not preserve our American freedoms.

That is the nearest we come to mentioning democracy.

I feel the same way today about Russian totalitarianism.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend.

I should like to say, Mr. President, that I told the Senator from Alabama I was going to comment upon what had transpired, but the Senator is not present.

I read further:

Mr. EASTLAND. The point is that if we were to lose permanently those markets, it would be followed first by Government control of business in this country. The Senator has spoken of the cotton business. If those markets for American raw cotton were to be permanently lost to us, the United States would have to begin with drastic acreage control and a subsidy program much greater than it has ever undertaken before. There would be Government control of every farmer in this country who is engaged in the production of cotton. That is true of other lines of business. There would first be Government control, and then, American industry could not profitably operate with the loss of those markets, as it cannot profitably operate unless it can run at capacity or near capacity. Foreign markets are essential to that. Within a period of a few years we would be driven to some form of socialism in this country. So, when we support this program and follow it by armed force, if necessary, we are saving the capitalistic system in the United States, because Russia knows that she could destroy our economy and our system without firing a shot simply by refusing to do business with us.

Mr. HILL. I thoroughly agree with the Senator. It is exactly what I sought to say, though the Senator has said it better and in more detail, when I spoke of the fact that if we permitted these western democracies to go down and if we lost our trade, we would be forced into such a system of governmental regimentation that we would lose many of our freedoms, and, to a greater or lesser degree, we would be forced ourselves into some form of totalitarian government.

We strive today to prevent war, to preserve and build the peace, and also to maintain our free private-enterprise system.

That is all of the discussion between the two Senators.

It is exactly what I have contended for approximately 2 years, that our foreign policy has set out to guarantee our domination of other countries in order that we may have places to which to export our manufactured and other goods.

We are stupid, Mr. President. There are those in this country who are too selfish to permit us to figure some way to permit American workers to share in the full product of the things which are produced by their labor. We must export in order to keep this so-called private-enterprise economy growing, or at least if it is to remain private enterprise. I think we can modify it with some socialism. We could have an area of some private enterprise for some entrepreneurs. We could keep our democracy, and we would not have to fight a war. But these bipartisan foreign-policyites are willing to risk the extermination of mankind with atom bombs and bacteriological warfare in order to preserve the monopolist domination of American big business all over the world.

I expect this bill to pass, not because it is right and not because the people want it or because of the power-politics approach which it represents, but because the Congress has drifted far from the thinking of the people. This state of affairs is not new to America. It has happened before—1932 is the most recent example. At that time, even as now, big business was in the saddle.

I cannot say that they were riding high—they had been riding high, but their selfish disregard of the general welfare had brought us to the verge of ruin. However, then as now, their stooges in places of power in the Government had shut their eyes and refused to read the handwriting on the wall, and a great political upheaval sent big business to the dog house and their political hangers-on to oblivion.

Mr. President, the bipartisan coalition which is inexorably driving this vicious and stupid piece of legislation through the Congress will, I am convinced, meet its Waterloo, come next November. I have described this piece of legislation as being vicious because I believe it makes infinitely more remote any possibility of reversing the present trend toward war and of preserving the peace of the world. I have called it stupid, at the same time, because I do not believe it will accomplish the desired object of those who sponsor it, namely, buying the friendship of western European nations with a view to their becoming our allies in an expected war against Soviet Russia. Friends cannot be bought, and we do not make allies of nations by interfering in their internal affairs.

This piece of legislation is vicious because it masquerades as unselfish aid for others when it is becoming more evident each day that its object is to use the taxpayers' dollars to aid American big business economically to dominate the so-called free-enterprise areas of the world.

It is stupid because it may well wreck our economy at home in a futile attempt to guarantee our economic supremacy abroad.

Mr. President, I believe I am as sincere as any man in my desire to feed hungry people and help rehabilitate the economy of stricken nations.

I am for aiding all those who need help, to the reasonable limit of our ability and resources. But I believe that all help should be channeled through the United Nations.

I believe in the United Nations. It is our only hope. The people of Idaho believe in it. They want to see it grow and become strong. They elected me on my promise to support such an organization to keep peace in the world.

In setting up all these schemes and plans like the Truman Doctrine as applied in Greece, and now the Marshall plan for all of Europe, we are not only failing to help the United Nations grow; we are positively undermining, weakening, and will eventually destroy the United Nations by such tactics.

The people of America have placed in the United Nations, all their hopes for peace, but they are coming to realize day by day that the architects and the planners of our foreign policy have no real interest in the United Nations.

The bipartisan coalition pays lip service to the United Nations, yes, as politicians are prone to pay lip service to any cause which they feel is popular with the people, whether it be old-age pensions, lower taxes, or development of natural resources in the West.

NO LOVE FOR UN

But they have no real interest in the United Nations.

The first concrete proof we had of this was when our Government took unilateral action in Greece and got this Nation into one of the worst messes in which America has ever found itself.

The latest proof of the lack of genuine interest in the United Nations on the part of our politicians with the bipartisan approach is the sell-out of Palestine.

Both old parties must take responsibility for these tragic fiascos because the leadership of both old parties boasts that they are as one on foreign policy.

The distinguished senior Senator from Michigan is hailed far and wide for his very able work in dissolving party lines in the Senate.

The distinguished senior Senator from Texas would doubtless like to take full credit if he could but figure some way to do so.

However, the glory of spending money to fight communism commands such attention in the press of America that even to bask in the reflection of the spotlight, throws an aura upon all those who can even get close to the center of the stage.

PROPAGANDA CONFUSES PEOPLE

The reactionary press, the generals and admirals, big figures in the finance and business world and, of course, those politicians who like to go with the tide, have created such a furor, hubbub and hullabaloo over the desirability of giving away billions and billions to try and bribe people not to be Communists, that our own people are utterly confused.

Mr. President, the word "Communist" reminds me of something. I realize that by taking the position I am assuming, namely, that the Russians are not absolutely hopeless, that it is possible to get along with them, I am laying myself open to the charge of being a Communist—a Communist sympathizer, at least. The distinguished senior Senator from Texas made that very plain a moment ago when I asked him whether he would want to see the veto abolished if a majority of the members of the United Nations were Communists. He retorted that he was not as much of an expert on communism as I was.

Mr. President, I dare say I may be subject to that, as I have stated, but I have made up my mind to that, and I warn all my colleagues, that I am not going to take it lying down. If they want to accuse me of being a Communist sympathizer, if they want to call me "red," and one thing and another, by insinuation or innuendo, Mr. President, I say, let them beware, because I shall come back in kind.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad to yield to my very good friend from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe I shall vote for the measure before the Senate, but I desire to say to the Senate now that I do not believe the Senator from Idaho is a Communist.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thank the Senator from the bottom of my heart. I appreciate his remark.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator will permit me, if the pending proposal is directed against communism, if its proponents are fighting communism, and they really mean it, why leave out Spain? The only country out of the whole group of the nations which fought the Russians right along was Spain. There are more Communists in Italy, more Communists in France, and more Communists in Greece than there are in all of Spain.

What I should like to see is a little sincerity of purpose. If the legislation is intended to protect the United States, I am for it absolutely; but let us not hear about it being against communism, because I do not believe it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not believe the bill is designed to fight communism in order to protect democracy. Rather, it is designed to fight the socialism of communism to protect capitalism, monopoly capitalism.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if it is to fight for democracy, why take in Portugal? Does any Member of the Senate believe that Portugal and many of the other countries which will be participants under the program are democracies?

Mr. TAYLOR. It has no relation to democracy, I am sorry to say to the Senator, just as relief to Greece has no relation to democracy, but is one of the most frightful chapters in the history of America, if not in the history of the world.

Even the politicians have become muddled by this great extravaganza of tub-thumping.

They have become so addled by the adulation of the press that many of them

honestly believe that it is good politics to get rid of billions of dollars no matter how ruthless and corrupt the scoundrels may be who receive it if they can but make our people believe they are fighting communism.

Even our Republican friends, long known for their economy talk—mostly talk—have succumbed to the great delusion.

However, the Democrats have beaten them to the punch.

They were giving away money all over the world with the exception of one place—China.

Of course, they had already given several billion dollars to China, but even the most extravagant spenders had decided that no possible good could come from pouring billions into China, so they had decided to let Chiang Kai-shek meet his just, though unhappy fate.

This was the opportunity the politically minded Republicans had been looking for.

Amid all the din and furor even they, with all their vaunted conservative good business judgment, have been overcome and, like children, fighting for a place to throw peanuts to the monkeys, the erstwhile tight-fisted cohorts of TABER have elbowed themselves a place near the money bags with loud shouts of "More money for Chiang. Billions for China."

They have taken advantage of this coveted opportunity with all the desperate enthusiasm of a month-old suckling pig scrambling for a vacant teat.

JOKER IN DECK

The joker in the deck of this supposed enthusiasm on the part of the American people for this great spending orgy is this:

All of the propaganda for this Marshall plan or this bipartisan European recovery plan, otherwise known as BERP, most recently rechristened ECA, all of this propaganda has insidiously conveyed the idea to the American people that this scheme would in some way strengthen the United Nations.

Of course, the truth of the matter is that it insolently bypasses the United Nations without so much as a by-your-leave to that fast expiring last hope of mankind.

Mr. President, I should like to quote here some testimony delivered before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by Mr. William Batt, Sr., which I culled from the voluminous reports of the hearings.

Mr. Batt is chairman of the Philadelphia branch of the Stimson committee dedicated to the unholy purpose of trying to convince the American people that in some way the ECA, otherwise known as BERP, originally the Marshall plan and before that the Dulles plan, will help the United Nations keep peace in the world.

But the truth will out, Mr. President, and in his testimony before the committee, Mr. Batt confirmed something that I have known for a long time but which may be surprising to some of my colleagues.

He told about how his committee, together with other organizations, such as

the Foreign Policy Association and the League of Women Voters, had taken polls in Philadelphia.

They found that people wanted to help Europe.

In fact, they wanted to help hungry people everywhere.

They were willing to be taxed for that purpose.

They did not want us to tell anybody that they could not have any more socialization, which revelation of incipient liberalism doubtless sent cold chills up the spine of industrialist Batt.

PEOPLE FOR UN

But the thing about this poll that is most significant and that a great many politicians seem to have overlooked is this—and I quote Mr. Batt:

As to administration of the plan, a majority would have this accomplished through the United Nations.

Yet, there is a distinct minority who would have the United States administer this aid alone.

Mr. President, that distinct minority doubtless includes Mr. Batt and his fellow industrialists who are looking for markets all over the world and see in the Marshall plan an excellent way securely to fasten their talons in prospective customers everywhere outside the zone of Russian influence.

It would also include John Foster Dulles and his moneyed friends in Wall Street.

With a few notable exceptions, this category would also include the generals and admirals who, because of its threat to their way of life, fear peace worse than a rattlesnake.

Then, of course, there are the politicians who like to go along with the big boys and have the press pat them on the back.

These people represent that distinct minority referred to by industrialist Batt.

The American people, Mr. President, are not going to be happy when they find out what has been done to them; how they have been fooled; how the United Nations has been bypassed, undermined—almost destroyed.

The time has come when lip service to the United Nations, no matter how loud, is no longer fooling the American people.

Palestine has brought these bipartisan, bypass-the-United-Nations foreign policy boys face to face with that awful question so well expressed in the boogey-woogey term, "is you is or is you ain't" for the United Nations.

BETRAYING PALESTINE

The oil interests and therefore the money interests and naturally therefore Mr. Forrestal because he represents the money interests and, of course, the military because of their natural inclinations and the more compelling reason that Mr. Forrestal is their boss, all these interests want us to betray Palestine for oil.

By their indecision in this matter the friendly mask of the United Nations has been drawn from their bipartisan countenances, and their two-faced duplicity is exposed for all the world to see, Mr. President.

I am going to discuss our foreign policy in general because anyone who stops to think for a moment must realize that this European-aid scheme is not something set apart.

It is some more of our foreign policy and to be understood it must be fitted into its proper place as part of our overall foreign policy.

It is naive to think for one moment that we can have a foreign policy which is a desert barren of Christian principles and studded with the cacti of the Truman doctrine and aid to reaction and then suddenly find an oasis in the midst of all this labeled ECA.

It is foolish to imagine that the scheme we are considering is any different than what has gone before.

It is the offspring of the same parents, Mr. and Mrs. Bipartisan Coalition.

Now, if as I have said, the American people want us to work through the United Nations, if they want to get along on friendly terms with the Russians, how in the world did we happen to be saddled with this get-tough foreign policy?

It is all really very simple, Mr. President.

All we have to do is put ourselves in the other fellow's place.

I have found that that is the best way to understand why people do certain things or why certain things happen.

Just put yourself in the other fellow's place.

Try to figure out what you would do in his place and generally it will be pretty easy to see why he behaved as he did.

Let us go back to the closing days of the last war.

Victory was assured.

Already there was brave talk of disarmament.

Not just a little disarmament, but total disarmament.

A glorious new organization had come into being, dedicated to the proposition of peace on earth.

The United Nations had been born.

CORPORATIONS AND GENERALS

Suddenly, the generals realized that their way of life was in grave danger of joining the dodo.

Now how would you feel under those circumstances, Mr. President, if you were a general?

How would any ordinary human being feel?

They had always been a privileged class, but during the war their power and prestige knew no bounds.

They were wine and dined, toasted and toadied to.

Honors were heaped upon them for the great victories they had won.

They did win great victories, Mr. President.

Of course, the GI's helped out a little but the generals won great victories and we want to give them all due credit.

They had billions to spend with no questions asked.

They spent most of it, of course, with the big corporations, General Motors, the Steel Trust, du Pont, and the others.

If the little fellows got a contract it was generally second-hand after the big boys had taken their cut out of it.

Of course we will not complain, Mr. President.

There was the war to be won and there was no time to worry whether or not we were strengthening monopolies.

But all of a sudden the war ended and all this talk of peace and disarmament.

If there were peace, there would be no more need for big armies.

Gone the privileges and honors, the brass and the braid.

Many of these generals were utterly unprepared for any other way of life.

They would have to start all over again, right at the bottom of the ladder, possibly.

Now how would an average man react under those circumstances?

I think he would do just what the generals did.

After all you cannot blame the generals for wanting to see their jobs continued.

The Bible says, "Where your purse is, there also is your heart," and if you have sufficient reason to want to believe something, if your very livelihood depends on it, it is the most natural thing in the world to rationalize the proposition until you actually become convinced that what you want to believe is right—even if you are trying to convince yourself that there should be armies and generals.

So that is what the generals did.

They wanted to stay generals but if they were to remain generals they would have to have a big army.

If they were to have a big army they must convince the American people and the Congress that the Army was necessary so that they could get billions of dollars to make the big army possible.

But in order to get the taxpayers to cough up the money for the big Army they had to convince the people that they were in danger of being attacked by somebody.

They had to have a bogeyman, Mr. President.

And who was the logical candidate?

There was only one—just one.

Just one country left sufficiently strong and big enough to be dressed up as a bogeyman.

That country was Russia.

PROPAGANDA AGAINST RUSSIA

So the generals started issuing statements about the danger of our being attacked.

They started pointing out how strong Russia had become.

They conveniently forgot that Russia had been devastated.

According to the experts, a devastation so great that to be equalled in this country we would have to be totally destroyed from Kansas City east.

They also conveniently forgot that Russia had lost somewhere in the neighborhood of 15,000,000 people in their great fight against the Fascist legions of Adolf Hitler.

But, Mr. President, the statements continued to emanate from high military authorities.

Politicians picked up the hue and cry.

The press, always looking for something sensational, was happy to join in.

Almost overnight, if you will go back and read the headlines, as I have recently done, the heroes of Stalingrad became the villains of the Kremlin.

It was as simple as that, Mr. President. Nor were the generals without friends in other high places.

The big corporation and cartel boys were happy to throw their influence behind any scheme to prevent peace and calm from settling upon the world.

They had become used to noncompetitive, lucrative armament contracts.

And while they dearly love private enterprise, it is nice to have Uncle Sam hand you millions and billions for heavy war equipment that the little fellows just cannot build at all.

So Wall Street was happy to join in.

Some of these anti-Russian agitators might not actually want war, but they do want to keep the tension just short of war so they can keep the armament racket rolling.

The trouble is, Mr. President, it is difficult to keep just the right tension.

As the distinguished and able senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] recently said, "Americans are not so constructed that they can hate any power for 4 years without being at war with it."

We gave the armed services eleven and a quarter billion dollars last year, Mr. President.

That is a great deal of money for the generals to spend with their corporation friends; and in the spending of eleven and a quarter billion dollars many attitudes can be influenced and even created.

A great deal of support cooked up in many different places.

So we are on our way again.

The United Nations is almost at the end of its rope.

The "get tough" foreign policy is rolling toward destruction like a streamlined train without an engineer.

Wall Street has taken over the Government and is keeping the surplus generals temporarily employed as civilian administrators in countless posts that never before have known the ponderous hand of the military.

HITLER'S IDEA

Remember, Mr. President, that both old parties must share the responsibility for this state of affairs.

This war economy is something so much to the liking of their moneyed masters that they are equally enthusiastic for the program.

In the matter of foreign affairs, Mr. President, there is no longer a two-party system in America.

We have a one-party system just as certainly as Hitler did, and it is beginning to appear that the only difference between the old parties in domestic policies is a matter of talk and messages on the state of the Union.

Now the bipartisan Wall Street military clique knew that their scheme was full of holes and wide open to criticism.

They knew it would be bad if the American people got wise to their schemes.

So what did they do, Mr. President?

They just took a page from Adolf Hitler's book and started a Red hunt.

Anybody who disagreed was a Communist.

They were in an excellent position to make it stick because they had most of the press. Mr. President, in the last 2 years the names of the liberal commentators who have disappeared from the radio, those who might have criticized and exposed this nefarious plot against the peace, but who have been booted off the radio for one excuse or another, are legion.

SCIENTISTS DISSATISFIED

It is very difficult, Mr. President, to stand up against this diabolical witch hunt.

Witness the attack on Dr. Edward Condon the last few days.

Here is a great American scientist, one of the greatest, who had already been cleared of suspicion; but in this witch hunt business, Mr. President, there is such a thing as double jeopardy.

If one of these committees or the FBI gestapo make up their mind to get a man, they will come at him again and again from every angle until either they get him thrown out or the tension becomes so great that he gives up and bows out.

We are going to wreck our atomic program with these methods, Mr. President, because scientists are self-respecting people who refuse to be hounded and shadowed and have the finger of suspicion constantly pointed at them.

Unfortunately, it takes brains to do scientific research, and men with brains just simply refuse to be kicked around.

However, that is beside the point.

Let us get back to the Red hunt.

Seeing the headlines given to the congressional Red hunters, politicians all over the country are going in the red-hunting business everywhere.

They have their own local Red hunt out in Los Angeles County.

Yes, it has gotten down to the county level now.

Out there the local edition of the Thomas committee, headed by a man by the name of Tenney, is going full blast.

Better than our big committee here, in fact.

Mr. Tenney personally made up a list of 150 organizations which he declared to be subversive.

Some of them have since been taken off the list when Mr. Tenney found out they had considerable numbers of voters on their membership rolls.

But in the beginning, Mr. President, anybody who belonged to any one of those 150 organizations was ineligible to hold a county or municipal job in Los Angeles County.

Perhaps it is important to be sure county employees are not Red sympathizers.

One of the employees of the sewer department in Los Angeles might tell the Russians the size of the sewer pipes, and they could conceivably sneak up through a sewer pipe in Los Angeles and sabotage the whole business.

The spectacle the American press is making of itself is a disgrace to the traditions of American journalism.

It is a bad day indeed when the word "Red" or "Russia" is not prominently displayed in a headline.

It is not an uncommon day when three or four headlines on the front page are devoted to "Reds," "Russia," or "Stalin," 999 times out of a thousand in a derogatory manner.

Last year I went on a meet-the-press program.

One sits at a table and is questioned by four or five newspaper reporters or columnists.

I like to get on that program.

It is a good place to have one's ego deflated.

I have forgotten exactly what the subject was.

I remember that the word "Russia" appeared in it somewhere.

But I knew that they would be asking me many questions about Russia.

You see, I have gone on the assumption that conditions between the Russians and us are bad enough without my trying to make them any worse, so I have refrained from seeking publicity by denouncing Russia every day of the week.

As a consequence of that, I guess, they have just put me down as a Russian sympathizer; and every time I get on a radio program in the nature of a debate or a question period, they always try to prove, either by questions, insinuations, or innuendoes, that I have my last check from Joe Stalin in my hip pocket.

I knew that would happen on that program, so I just tore the front page off the Washington papers for a few days before the broadcast, and took them along with me.

We had not gotten very far with the program when one of my inquisitors came at me with a question something like this:

Now, Senator TAYLOR, do you actually believe that it is possible for us to get along with the Russians?

SENSATIONAL PRESS

I said:

Yes; I think it might be possible if the press would just start telling the truth and quit sensationalizing every disagreement with the Russians.

Of course, Mr. President, that got the boys all excited. They all tried to get at me at once. Finally the moderator got them quieted down a little and designated one to chew me up.

He said:

Why, Senator TAYLOR, do you mean to insinuate that the great American press doesn't present the facts as they are? Do you mean that we're not fair? What do you mean?

So I just pulled those front pages of the Washington papers out of my pocket and said, "Here is what I mean." And I started reading the headlines. I would read an anti-Russia headline and a little of the article, and then ask them if they could not have put a more truthful and a less sensational anti-Russia headline on the article. Well, sir, they did not have much to say.

I remember one page I had particularly. It was off the Times-Herald, as I remember. It was just a few days after a girl had been murdered out in Los Angeles—the Black Dahlia murder case. This particular front page had an article in the upper left-hand corner, about three columns wide, "Reds stealing election in Poland." Down in the middle of

the page was another article with a border around it to attract attention, and it said, "Reds refuse to return lend-lease ships." Over on the right-hand side was another headline, "Red butchers Black Dahlia."

I had been reading about the Black Dahlia, and when I saw that headline I thought, "Oh, my goodness, what has this Communist done now?"

That is what most anybody would think when they saw a headline like that, Mr. President, is it not?

However, it is a well-known fact that a great many Americans do not read past the headline. They do not have time to. They come home after a hard day's work, pick up the newspaper, read the headlines, turn over and see what Dick Tracy is doing, and how Li'l Abner is getting along, and it is time to go to bed.

But I try to read the papers to keep up on what is going on in the world; so when I read that headline "Red butchers Black Dahlia," I started to read the article. It said:

Police today are searching for Charlie "Red" Johnson, wanted in connection with the murder of the Black Dahlia.

Well, of course, when you read that, it was plain that "Red" was not red; and as it turned out, he did not even murder the Black Dahlia. But the headline had done its dirty work.

Mr. President, misleading headlines are conditioning the American people every day for another war which will mean the end of the world.

Oh, yes, Mr. President, on that same front page, on the back side, on the inside column, down about the middle of the page, was a little article about 4 column-inches, that said, "Russia demobilizes 4,000,000 men."

MISLEADING HEADLINES

I asked those newspaper reporters if their paper could not have put "Russia demobilizes 4,000,000 men" across the front page, and if that would not have been a little more conducive to peace, and then let "Red butchers the Black Dahlia" over in the middle some place. They did not have much to say. They could not have much to say, Mr. President, because the American press, either maliciously or for the sake of a little additional circulation based on sensationalism, is getting the American people in a frame of mind something like that of a man who has been sentenced to hang, and has no recourse. He says, "Oh well, it's got to be. Let's hurry up and get it over with."

That is what some people want, Mr. President. If they can get enough people to feel like that, they can lead them on this holy crusade against communism. There will be no enthusiasm for it, of course. People know that another war means the end of everything. They will go because they would rather get it over with than sweat out the headlines, day after day, month after month.

THE HEARST PRESS

Mr. President, for a long period of time, the Hearst press banged away at the idea that we must eventually fight Russia. Finally, Mr. Hearst decided he had the people in the frame of mind to fight

his war. So he put this editorial in his newspapers, in the form of a letter to his editors. It had a border around it, on the front page—appropriately enough, a heavy black border. Here is what it had to say:

R. T. VAN ETTISCH,
Managing Editor,
Los Angeles Examiner.

DEAR MR. VAN ETTISCH: Almost everybody knows the evils of communism nowadays.

Almost everybody knows the impudence and the insincerity of Russia.

We no longer have to give so much space to Russia—to the danger to our free institutions from communism, to the probable destructive attack upon our Nation by Russia.

The thing of importance now, is the plan for the protection of our country, particularly the plan of universal military service.

We must awaken the public and the Government to the importance of this plan.

Mr. Hearst feels himself bigger than the Government. He has this to say:

Every American must be a soldier ready at a moment's notice to defend his country and to defend it not merely from invasion but from annihilation.

There will be no time to make soldiers when war comes.

They must be prefabricated.

WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST.

Prefabricated soldiers! Imagine, Mr. President, even before we can build prefabricated houses for the heroes of the last war, we are asked to make prefabricated soldiers for the next war.

Immediately the Hearst papers stopped harping so much on the inevitability of fighting Russia, and started an all-out campaign for universal military training.

Here are two headlines from different editions of the Los Angeles Examiner of October 13, 1947: "Los Angeles Leaders Demand Nation Leaders Prepare Against Red Attack," and "Arms Training Demand Grows."

O Mr. President, Mr. Hearst can get many people to dance to his music whenever he controls things, especially politicians.

Such propaganda is criminal, Mr. President, and there should be laws to severely punish those who seek to inflame the public mind. I tell you, Mr. President, you cannot beat this Red hunt. They will get you coming and going.

ROYALL WITCH HUNT

I remember when Secretary Royall was up for confirmation. His name fits him well. He is of the elite. He belongs to the upper crust. But this committee found out that Mr. Royall's half sister was married to Johannes Steel. Johannes Steel, as Senators know, is a New York radio commentator—or he was, and he was accused of being pinkish. So the committee had Royall up posthaste. They wanted to know what about this.

"What about this, Mr. Royall? Is it true your sister is married to this pink commentator, Johannes Steel?" Mr. Royall coughed and spluttered and turned as red as Johannes' reputation. He said she was only his half sister, but he had to admit she was married to Johannes. Aha! They had him!

But Mr. Royall tried to wiggle out of it. He protested that it was his sister's privilege to marry anybody she wished. After

all, he was not married to Johannes and he was not responsible for his political beliefs.

In fact, he did not know Johannes very well, did not associate with him very much. The truth of the matter was, the last time he had seen him was last Christmas, and that was at a party at his mother's house where the whole family had gotten together to celebrate Christmas. One of the committee members leaned over the table and said, "Well, what kind of man are you, Mr. Royall, that you don't love your brother-in-law?"

So you see you cannot beat them. No, sir, they have got you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, we all know that the Communists generally oppose anything this bipartisan, Wall Street, military clique is for, so if you happen to be against it also you are following the party line and they nail you to the cross. It is getting so, Mr. President, that thousands upon thousands of loyal Americans are afraid to express any opinion at variance with the line laid down by the bipartisan moguls for fear of being called Red or subversive. They are afraid to join the most innocent-appearing organization, like a book club, for fear they will see their names in the paper some day as belonging to a Red-front organization.

CROSS-COUNTRY RIDE

Mr. President, a number of Senators have jokingly asked me how my cross-country horseback ride turned out. I might dwell on that for a moment, because some of the things I discovered on that trip may be enlightening to my fellow Senators. I became convinced about 2 years ago that this bipartisan foreign policy was not all it was supposed to be. I was very hesitant to criticize it, because everybody of any consequence seemed to be for it, and I, like most other people, want to be on the popular side if I possibly can. But the more I studied the matter the more I became convinced that this wonderful bipartisan foreign policy was leading us toward war.

I would just about make up my mind to speak out against it and then I would turn on the radio or pick up a newspaper, and there would be Senator Claghorn saying, "It is no use—sooner or later we will have to fight the Russians." I would think, well, that fellow is pretty smart, who are you to argue with him? You never had much schooling; you were just a showman before you came to the Senate. Where do you get off, criticizing this fellow? So I would get out the books and I would read the history of our relations with Russia for the past two or three decades since the revolution—it is very important to do that—and I would look at the foreign policy with all its ramifications. I have a great many newspaper clippings, and I would look at them. It is possible to obtain information from the newspapers if you read beyond the headlines. I would go over it all again and I would say, "Well, I am right, I do not care what that smart fellow says. This foreign policy is no good." I would make up my mind to speak, and then I would look at the newspaper and Bishop Holier Than Thou would be saying, "We should fight the Russians, there

is no other way out of it." I would think, well, that fellow is honest, he ought to know what he is talking about; maybe there is something the matter with your line of reasoning, TAYLOR; maybe you had better look it over. And I would. I guess I did that a half dozen times, and I would come up with the same conclusion that the Russians were not entirely to blame and that our foreign policy certainly had its faults. Finally, I definitely made up my mind that our foreign policy was so bad that I had to actively oppose it. I realized what the consequences would be—how I would be Red baited and according to the polls, I would have very little popular support, but regardless of that I decided to bow my neck and go ahead.

First, I went to Idaho to talk to the people there so they would not get a second-hand version of what I had to say. I had planned this tour of my home State early last fall, but Mrs. Taylor was taken ill and I had to call it off. However, my secretary was already in Idaho, so I told him to go ahead and take a trip around the State and find out what the people were thinking.

BETTER GO ALONG

He made a thorough canvass of the situation and after 2 or 3 weeks he called me in California, where we had gone for Mrs. Taylor's operation, and he said to me, "Senator, you had better just forget your opposition to the foreign policy. I have been all over the State—the politicians are all for it. They have been reading the Gallup poll. Truman's stock is up." That was last fall, Mr. President. "They have the smell of patronage in their nostrils—foreign policy is sort of abstract—it is way across the ocean. Their advice is that if you cannot go along you had just better keep quiet."

So I said, "All right," and I tried to forget it for a week or so, and then I got to thinking, "well, what is the difference whether you are reelected or not? If we go ahead and get into a war it will be the end of everything anyhow—this is no time to hedge—you had better fight for what you think is right and let the future take care of itself or there may be no future."

So I called some of my friends in Idaho on a Saturday night and asked them to arrange six meetings for me, starting the following Monday, with a meeting in our capital city of Boise.

The only advertising we had was one ad in the newspaper in the nature of an open letter from the Senator to the people of Idaho, in which I said that I had become convinced that our foreign policy was leading us toward war and I wanted to talk it over with them and get their advice and reactions to what I had to say, and what they wanted me to do. With only 1 day's advertising I did not think there would be a hundred people at that meeting, but the Crystal Ballroom of the city's largest hotel was packed and people were turned away.

PEOPLE AGAINST POLICY

After I had finished speaking I put up to the audience the question of whether I should continue fighting our foreign policy. I asked those who wanted me to go ahead and carry the fight against this

bipartisan foreign policy as vigorously as possible to stand up.

I cautioned them not to stand if they did not think I should go ahead. They would merely have me work hard for no good reason. I wanted their honest reactions. I estimated that 85 percent of those present stood. I estimated very conservatively because I did not want the local press, which is bitterly anti-Taylor, to be able to say that I had fudged. A more accurate estimate of those who favored my stand would have been 90 or 95 percent.

But what was even more significant than the rising vote of confidence was the behavior of that representative Idaho crowd after the meeting was over. At most meetings I have held in Idaho in the past, considerable numbers of people would stay to shake hands with the Senator when it was over, but after 10 or 15 minutes a good many of them would become discouraged and leave—but not that night. I shook hands for an hour and those who came up to greet me not only shook my hand but they clung to it and asked God's blessing upon me in the fight that I was undertaking. The people want peace. They realize what war means.

This happened at every meeting in Idaho—bigger crowds than I had ever talked to—and the same fervor was apparent everywhere.

I was astonished. Of course, I was pleased and happy, but it was a revelation to find the totally different attitude displayed by the people as against the attitude of the politicians.

Inasmuch as they had given me a mandate I decided to do what I could to implement it.

PRESS INFLAMMATORY

Observation and experience had shown me that the press was only too willing to give generous publicity to any third-rate administrator or politician who would make an inflammatory statement against Russia.

However, those who spoke out for a policy of trying to get along with the Russians were either called simpletons or "Red sympathizers" in the briefest possible space on the fourth page.

I realized that if I was to get any attention for what I had to say I would have to have some other approach besides the time-honored method of making speeches.

So I decided to ride a horse across the Nation.

I intended to ride from San Francisco to New York originally, but I couldn't get started in time because of Mrs. Taylor's slow recovery, so I moved south to Los Angeles, intending to take the southern route across the Nation to Atlanta.

My reason for riding a horse was simply this: In order to rate attention in the press, a thing must either be sensational, sexy, or represent conflict. Of course, you can get attention if you are an elder statesman, like the senior Senator from Michigan.

Certainly what I had to say in behalf of peace was neither sensational, sexy, or in the nature of a conflict, and I was not an elder statesman but just a comparatively young, unknown Senator.

I decided to ride the horse because that would be sensational.

A Senator riding a horse across the Nation would be out of the ordinary.

It is not every Senator that can get on a horse.

Of course, Mr. Truman called a special session about that time and spoiled the effectiveness of my ride.

It is a pity, too, when we consider that nothing was accomplished in the special session.

I had planned to make the trip in 3 months or a little longer by having two horses and riding each one a half-day. I flattered myself that I was as tough as two horses.

I thought perhaps I would not get much attention for the first 60 days or 1,500 miles but most of that time would have been spent in the cactus or antelope country anyhow and it was my hope that by the time I reached a more populous section of our country the people would begin to become interested—the press would pick it up—and quite possibly in writing about the Senator who was riding across the country on a horse they would slip in a line or two now and then of what I had to say. I felt strongly about it. I still feel strongly about it.

RODE 275 MILES

As I say, the special session spoiled my plans.

We had to hurry and haul the horses most of the way.

In fact, I was in the saddle for only about 275 miles.

But I did hold a number of meetings, arranged on brief notice, with little advance publicity.

The first one was at the University of Arizona, at Tucson, under the sponsorship of the University International Relations Club, the AVC, and United World Federalists.

We had a crowd of over a thousand on the university campus in a large hall there—students, townspeople, and faculty members.

When I finished talking, I told the listeners that it was the first talk on this subject I had made outside my home State.

I wanted to know how they felt about what I had said—whether they felt I should continue trying to arouse the people against our bipartisan foreign policy. I told them that if no one was interested, I was wasting my breath. I was convinced that we were heading toward the end of everything, and if they wanted to do nothing about it, I would go out and play golf until we were all blown up.

I asked the vice president of the university what percentage of the people were standing, and he said, "Well, at least 95 percent."

After the meeting I again had to stay to shake hands with great numbers of people, most of whom said, "Senator, we agree with you and we want to help. What can we do?"

I was at a loss.

I had to say, "Well, I do not know that there is anything you can do. Both parties are for this foreign policy. There is no way for you to express your opposition at the polls. About the only thing

you can do is to write a letter to your Congressman."

Some of them had had experience writing to Congressmen before and were not very enthusiastic about it.

But that was all I had to offer at that time.

I held several other meetings in El Paso; Fort Worth; Austin; Norris, Tenn.; Oak Ridge, Tenn.; and Washington, D. C.

In El Paso we met in a Y. M. C. A. meeting room seating approximately 350 people. Friends had arranged the meeting on short notice. I sent them no money. They were folks who believed as I did. They got busy. They said, "If we have 50 people present it will be good." The audience came up to the meeting room on an old, decrepit elevator, and the room was packed.

I looked forward to the meeting in Norris, Tenn., partly because of my admiration for Senator Norris and because I thought this would be a very good meeting, since it would be attended by people at Norris working for the TVA.

I thought they should be quite liberal in their political leanings.

At the close of that meeting I again asked those who agreed with my criticism of our foreign policy, if they wanted me to continue my fight against it, to stand.

The chairman said there was just a little over 50 percent standing, and he was right.

After what had happened at my previous meetings, with 90 percent and 95 percent urging me on, I was somewhat surprised.

I thought perhaps I knew the reason for this poor showing, and my suspicions were confirmed.

PEOPLE AFRAID

After the meeting, when my listeners came up to shake hands with me, nearly everyone of them moved in close as they passed by and said, in a whisper, "Senator, you would have had 90 percent or 95 percent—or maybe 100 percent—standing here tonight, but we all work for the Government and we are being investigated."

Mr. President, that is a sad commentary on the state of affairs in America.

I never thought I would live to see the day in this supposedly free country when people would be afraid to stand up and be counted for the things in which they believe.

Mind you, Mr. President, I had not asked them if they thought we ought to have a revolution.

All I was doing was criticizing our sacred bipartisan foreign policy.

All this, of course, is a result of the vicious witch hunt and smear technique that our native fascists have lifted from the files of Herr Goebbels.

In Oak Ridge, Tenn., I spoke to the atomic scientists and excused them from any expression of opinion.

I told them what had happened at Norris and said "if those people at Norris who work for the TVA are under such pressure one can only imagine what a strain you are under here at Oak Ridge."

So I did not ask them to stand.

I got a considerable round of cynical laughter and excellent applause.

However, in Washington I had an experience that compensated for the sad state of affairs existing at Oak Ridge and Norris.

I rode in from Mount Vernon horseback. Everyone was very cooperative. Those in charge cleared the Mall for me. That was not necessary. I could steer a horse in the midst of pedestrians. We arranged a meeting at the Interior Auditorium.

It was on a Sunday night.

Everyone said it would be impossible to get a crowd on that night and besides Senators were a dime a dozen in Washington.

The auditorium was packed and they turned a great many people away.

And, in ending the meeting, I told them what had occurred at Norris and that I had excused the audience from voting at Oak Ridge.

I said that I realized that probably more than half of my listeners were Government employees and that although I would like to know how they felt I could not put them on the spot by asking a rising vote.

They laughed and applauded and then somebody jumped up and the whole audience, without one exception, stood and gave me one of the finest ovations I have ever received.

That convinced me that the American people were ready to fight against these attacks on their civil liberties; their constitutional privilege of saying and thinking what they please; that they were eager and anxious to boot out the bipartisan war-policy makers—if only they had fearless leadership.

Later, I found out there were five FBI agents in the hall that evening busily spotting those who came to hear me as I spoke not to urge violence against our Government, but in criticism of this dastardly bipartisan foreign policy.

Mr. President, this is America—1948 style, Mr. President—but we are going to change all that in November.

I have recited this brief account of my cross-country trip to document my contention that the American people are living in fear not so much of Russia but of their own Government.

Anyone who dares oppose this thing that has become a one-party state—at least insofar as foreign affairs are concerned—anyone opposing this, gravely jeopardizes his political future, and any person who works for wages in or out of the Government runs a grave risk of losing his job, and indeed, his opportunity to earn a living at all.

Thank goodness we still have a secret ballot in America and, unless a crisis is provoked and that last freedom taken away from us before November, the people are going to speak with a voice so loud that it will shatter the glass houses of those who profess to believe in freedom for all people, but who would deny it to our citizens here at home.

COMMUNIST STRENGTH

While we are on this question of the Red hunt that is trying to scare people out of their wits with the Communist bugaboo, I would like to read into the RECORD some figures on communistic strength in this country:

In 1928, just at the close of the so-called "golden twenties," the Communist vote in America was one-eighth of 1 percent of the total vote cast.

In 1932, when we were in the very depths of despair, the Communist vote rose to the very dangerous figure of one-fourth of 1 percent.

In 1936 conditions had improved somewhat and the Communist strength receded to one-sixth of 1 percent.

By 1940, people were eating more or less regularly and the Communists lost still more ground and their vote was one-eleventh of 1 percent.

This graphically illustrates the fact that communism only thrives, if you can call the one-fourth of 1 percent that they received in 1932 thriving, when people are hungry—unemployed—or otherwise dissatisfied.

Mr. President, all this Red scare is designed solely for the purpose of preventing criticism of this bipartisan foreign policy, the real purpose of which is to keep generals employed, pass out juicy plums for a continuing armament program to the vested interests of America, and of course to protect the foreign investments of our cartel monopolies.

That was admitted by two very distinguished Senators on the floor of the Senate just before I started speaking.

As I said in a radio address the other evening, Mr. President, when the big steel companies raised their prices they did more to disillusion the honest common people of America, they did more to aid the cause of communism than all the efforts of all our Communists throughout all the years.

I shall discuss the question of how the American people are being bullied and coerced by investigating committees and our native gestapo at greater length at some future time.

RUSSIA HAS REASON TO BE SUSPICIOUS

Now, to get back to our relations with Russia. To understand how the Russians might feel toward us—toward the rest of the world for that matter—it is necessary to review briefly what has transpired between the western powers and Russia since the days of their revolution.

They had a revolution.

Of course, I guess everybody knows that we had a revolution, too, Mr. President.

Not so long ago—only yesterday in the perspective of history.

We fought against tyranny and economic oppression.

We were called Communists and the statesmen of older, established governments pointed with alarm to our radicalism.

The Russians revolted against the tyranny of the Czar.

He was in the habit of passing out juicy concessions to his friends in England and France who came in and exploited the Russian people mercilessly.

The nobles had a pleasant custom of taking the virgin daughters of peasants on their estates to help entertain their distinguished guests.

If ever a people were ground down and oppressed, the Russians were.

The church in Russia aided and abetted this un-Christian state of affairs.

It was not a church as we think of churches, Mr. President, rather it was part of the Czar's machinery for keeping the people in ignorance and subjection.

So, naturally, when the Russians overthrew the Czar they also kicked out the corrupt clergy.

This, of course, gave the western world a great opportunity to holler about the godless Bolsheviks.

Their real reasons, of course, were that they were losing their lucrative concessions, their sources of raw materials, and cheap labor.

But, nevertheless, the Russian people went ahead with their house cleaning.

They were called all sorts of vile names—just as we were cursed when we rose up under the leadership of George Washington to assert our rights and threw off our shackles—but the rest of the world did not stop with calling the Russians names.

OUR INTERVENTION IN RUSSIA

Armies of 14 nations invaded Russia. We helped rearm the recently defeated Germans so they could send an army into Russia. The British and French made an agreement to divide the rich Crimea and the oil-rich Caucasus between them and they sent armies into Russia to try to overthrow the revolution.

We sent an army into Russia.

Of course, Congress did not authorize it but then, as now, the Army had just finished a victorious war and did not bother with a little thing like asking Congress.

They just sent the soldiers in to fight the Russians on one pretext or another.

Albeit, to their everlasting credit, some of the generals and many of the soldiers did not like the idea and raised considerable fuss about it; but, if I remember correctly, it remained for Senator Borah finally to call the matter to the attention of Congress so forcefully that our army of intervention was withdrawn.

Then, as now, the American people had contributed generously to feed the hungry peoples of Europe.

Herbert Hoover subverted large quantities of that food to help feed the armies of intervention.

But, in spite of all this interference, the outside world failed to break the spirit of the Russian people and finally the invaders had to withdraw.

TERRITORY TAKEN FROM RUSSIA

Of course, in the process they did take large slices of Russian territory in which so-called free governments were set up as a cordon sanitaire around Russia.

I want to make the flat statement right here and now that not one of those governments was a whit more democratic than the government the Russians set up, and the common people generally fared worse economically than they would have under Russian rule.

The one exception was Finland.

Their General Mannerheim, a Swedish nobleman, trained by the Germans, came into power.

Of course, he had to line up some 20,000 women, men, and children, and shoot them down in order to establish democracy—but he did it—and the Finns had

a pretty good government, according to western standards.

Now, Mr. President, there has been a great deal of fuss because the Russians have reabsorbed the territories that were taken away from them.

Might I ask this question:

Suppose the Japs had whipped us in this recent war.

Suppose they had taken Oregon, Washington, and California away from us and set them up as jumping-off places in case they wanted to fight us again; that they had made each of those States an independent sovereign nation with a government acceptable to the Japanese.

Mr. President, what do you think we would do under those circumstances the first time the opportunity presented?

If I know the American people, I think we would take Washington, Oregon, and California back into the Union.

But some people will say, "The Lithuanians, the people of Latvia, and all of those other hapless people did not want to be taken back by the Russians."

I wonder if California, Oregon, and Washington would want to come back into the United States after they had enjoyed sovereignty for 20 years or so.

The first thing the Japs would have done would have been to purge the history books in order to make us appear as the terrible exploiters of the Pacific coast, and in each of these sovereign States there would be a full complement of Federal office holders, a president of California, a senate of California, a congress of California, a supreme court of California, cabinet officials, a judiciary, all the Federal bureaucrats whose livelihood and way of life would depend on the continuing independence of California.

Can you not hear the speeches that would ring out in the capitol of that great and sovereign nation if they were threatened by aggression from the imperialist United States pushing from the east?

I will wager that they would have hollered, "Help, Japan! Help, Germany! We are about to be taken over. The big, bad United States is invading us, and is going to destroy our Japanese democracy. Save our Japanese democracy."

PLOTS AGAINST RUSSIA

Now, Mr. President, whether that is a fair analogy or not, the fact remains that the Russians did reabsorb these territories.

After the treatment the Russians received during that trying period at the hands of the rest of the world, is it not conceivable that they have a right to be suspicious?

If you were a Russian, Mr. President, do you not think you would be a little mistrustful of the good intentions of capitalist countries?

The plots and schemes that were hatched against the Russians in the years between the two World Wars were many and fantastic.

High government officials were bribed to participate and subverted with promises of power when the Russian Government was overthrown.

Fabulous amounts of money were poured into these plots by the governments and individual capitalists of the

outside world. They wanted then, and they still want, to overthrow the Russian Government so they can exploit the vast resources of that rich country for private gain.

Many generals of the Red Army were bribed to turn traitor and give military information, aid, and assistance to the capitalist powers.

Mr. President, if we had gone through what the Russians have had to suffer in the way of intervention and fifth-column activities, we would have reason indeed to be suspicious.

The Russians are suspicious and mistrusting, and I believe they have a right to be.

The same people—Wall Street and the military—are in power in America today that were jointly responsible for the sabotage of Russia's economic plans and the lots against her sovereignty, and in addition they have the atomic bomb.

At present we are busily engaged in rounding up every displaced monarch, every person of any stature who could possibly be useful in forming governments in exile.

I want to give sanctuary to the oppressed and the exiled, but we are openly financing and publicizing these outs with the avowed intention of using them for further fifth-column activity.

Now, let us review Russia's record between wars.

Have they behaved in those years like people who want chaos in the world?

Did they behave like people who wanted wars in the hope that they might spread their doctrines in the confusion that inevitably follows war?

Is that the way they behaved in 1933?

Litvinoff, at the League of Nations at Geneva, urgently proposed that the world disarm.

Did we take him up on the proposition?

Nobody paid any attention to him. He was called that Bolshevik, Litvinoff.

Who protested most vehemently over the invasion of Ethiopia and when Czechoslovakia was invaded? The Russians offered to fight if the western world would help, but again they were given the cold shoulder.

When they asked for military consultation with a view to stopping Hitler the western powers sent underlings to engage in conversations with them.

Finally, the Russians signed a non-aggression pact with Hitler.

The apologists for Russia contend that there was nothing else they could do under the circumstances.

They realized that they would inevitably have to fight Hitler—probably alone.

They were stalling for time.

Mr. President, I believe that our recent publication of secret documents was the most senseless piece of war-mongering one can possibly imagine.

With relations already severely strained, I can reach no other conclusion than that they were published with the diabolical purpose of increasing the tension and conditioning our people for war.

However, even those documents, which were so evidently intended to inflame our people and help the bipartisan schemes get this bill through Congress, disclosed that Hitler's last bitter complaint before

he invaded Russia was that Stalin had double-crossed him, had not lived up to the pact, and had used that time to build his defenses against Germany.

The Russia haters say that the pact was indefensible—a dirty, low-down, yellow-dog-hound-pup trick.

I am not arguing the point.

You can take your choice.

At any rate, they fought fairly well, and shortly we found ourselves fighting as their allies.

ERA OF GOOD WILL

Roosevelt had started an era of good feeling between us by recognizing the Russians in 1933.

The bond of friendship between us continued to grow and expand until the time of Roosevelt's death.

Mr. President, a double tragedy struck the people of the United States and the world on April 12, 1945.

President Roosevelt died and Harry Truman became President of the United States.

Up until that moment, our relations with Russia had been improving.

I have a graph which I clipped from a newspaper showing how the line went up and up.

In fact, it went up until Potsdam.

That is where Mr. Truman first met with Stalin.

From there on the line descends to the vanishing point in the lower right-hand corner.

Is there any wonder, Mr. President? Here is a man charged with the responsibility of guiding our foreign affairs. The only hope of keeping peace in the world is to find some way to get along with the Russians. Is it any wonder that he has failed to get along with the Russians? When Hitler invaded Russia, Mr. Truman was then a Senator, and he is reported by the New York Times to have said, "If we see that Germany is winning we ought to help Russia and if Russia is winning we ought to help Germany. In that way, let them kill as many as possible."

If you were a Russian—Joe Stalin—or any Russian—would you have much confidence in the good intentions of a man who had made such an intemperate, blood-thirsty statement?

I am afraid we are laboring under an insurmountable handicap in this field.

BEGINNING OF MISUNDERSTANDING

It seems that the real beginning of our misunderstanding was when the Russians engineered a coup in Rumania and the Communists took over. But, Mr. President, why put all the blame for this on the Russians?

In his book, *Speaking Frankly*, Mr. Byrnes has this to say:

In the fall of 1944, Churchill and his Foreign Minister, Anthony Eden, had visited Moscow and, while there was no formal agreement, we knew they had reached the informal understanding that, if the British found it necessary to take military action to quell internal disorders in Greece, the Soviets would not interfere. In return, the British would recognize the right of the Soviets to take the lead in maintaining order in Rumania.

No wonder the British hesitated to protest later, when we asked them to do so, when the Russians started fixing things up to their liking in Rumania.

After all, the Russians were acting under an agreement which the British had suggested.

Let us see what Cordell Hull has to say in his book about this arrangement. I quote from chapter 30:

When the Russian Army began to push into Rumania, in April 1944, the relationship between the Soviet Union and the Balkans came to the forefront of our diplomacy. Suddenly British Ambassador Halifax inquired of me on May 30, 1944, how this Government would feel about an arrangement between the British and Russians whereby Russia could have controlling influence in Rumania and Britain a controlling influence in Greece.

He handed me a written communication from his Government asking whether we had any objection to an agreement between Britain and Russia whereby, in the main, Rumanian affairs should be the concern of the Soviet Government and Greek affairs the concern of the United Kingdom.

Mr. Hull says he objected to any such agreement because he did not believe spheres of influence would be conducive to peace.

However, Mr. Churchill was persistent.

In speaking of Churchill's further efforts in this direction, Mr. Hull goes on to say:

It seemed reasonable to him (meaning the Prime Minister) that the Russians should deal with the Rumanians and Bulgarians and that Britain should deal with the Greeks, who were in Britain's theater of operations, were Britain's old allies and for whom Britain had sacrificed 40,000 men in 1941. The same, he added, was true of Yugoslavia.

I quote further from Mr. Hull's memoirs:

This telegram was important in that it brought in two countries not hitherto mentioned by the British—Bulgaria to be dealt with by Russia, and Yugoslavia to be dealt with by Britain.

When we read further, Mr. President, we find that this arrangement was agreed to.

The only fly in the ointment was that Yugoslavia refused to behave and broke their ties with Britain by setting up a government of their own choosing.

It is really too bad that the Yugoslavs were so short-sighted, Mr. President. Otherwise they might now be enjoying under King Peter all the aid and comfort that we have given to Greece. It is disturbing.

But a further aspect of the matter is this: Mr. Churchill did not consult us prior to the time he approached the Russians.

This is brought out where Mr. Hull tells of writing a letter to the President about the matter.

I sent him (meaning the President) a letter on June 17, in which I pointed out that Mr. Churchill openly applied his proposition to the entire Balkan region by mentioning Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, in addition to Rumania and Greece, and that he advanced our position in South America as an analogy.

You see, Mr. President, even our good friend Winston Churchill does not hesitate to call attention to the fact that we

dominate our neighbors—so why should not other people?

But to return to Secretary Hull's story:

I also called attention to what I termed an "extremely disturbing aspect of this matter," namely, that the British had not discussed a proposal of this nature with us until after it had been put up to the Russians and the latter inquired whether we had been consulted.

So, you see, the Russians were better behaved than the British. They insisted on living up to their agreement by making certain before they made any deals with wily old Churchill, that we had been consulted. At that time, at least, Mr. President, the Russians were not the double-crossers we have since been led to believe they are.

A NO-GOOD FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. President, I think everyone will agree that a foreign policy should be good for something. I contend that our foreign policy is good for nothing. If we want war, if we want to fight the Russians, then our foreign policy should make friends of every possible nation which might be of help to us in such a struggle. If we want peace, then our foreign policy should be aimed at the goal of getting along with the Russians. I contend that it has done neither of these things. We have alienated the Russians, and we are busily engaged in making enemies of people all over the world.

Just suppose we want to fight the Russians or that we are convinced that war with Russia is inevitable. We should be making friends all around the world, should we not? And, when I say making friends, I mean making friends of the common people, because cardboard governments, bolstered up with our dollars and arms would be of little use in any conflict unless the people were behind the governments and friendly toward us.

TRIP AROUND THE WORLD—THE PHILIPPINES

Let us take a quick trip around the world and see what goes on.

We shall head west to the Philippines.

If anybody is going to be our friend and ally, it should be the Philippines. Did not we give them their independence? Did not we save them from those awful Spaniards? Have not we generously purchased their sugar and hemp? Yes; the Philippines should be our friends. I am sorry to say, Mr. President, that the picture is not quite that rosy.

We took the Philippines from the Spaniards, but we left the same feudal exploiters in control. But, you say, did not we give them their independence? That is right; but before we permitted them to embark upon the seas of international strife as a sovereign nation, we made them rewrite their constitution. They had prepared a constitution in anticipation of that great day. They doubtless thought it was a good constitution. But it had a provision in it saying that no foreigner could own more than 49 percent of any business in the Philippines.

They did not mind being helped by outside capital, but they did not want

to be exploited; so they wrote that provision in their constitution.

Did we wish them luck in seeking economic self-rule, as well as political freedom? No, Mr. President; instead, we said, "Look here, you Filipinos, we have done a lot for you. We do not mind your keeping out other exploiters and promoters, but an American businessman can do anything he pleases in the Philippines, understand? If you want your freedom, change that constitution * * * that provision does not apply to Americans."

So the Filipinos changed their constitution.

I wonder how we would have felt, Mr. President, if some great power had told those men who wrote our Constitution—Madison, Jefferson, Adams, and the rest—what to put in it. I wonder if they would have liked it? I do not believe so.

The plain fact of the matter is the Filipinos did not like it, either. They still do not like it. But they had to take it.

We also made them let us keep military bases in the midst of their newfound sovereignty. We could occupy their islands in a few brief days. What kind of sovereignty is that? But they accepted that, too.

Then, we got behind a man we wanted to be their President. We like to have friendly governments in our sphere of influence, too, Mr. President. Did we select a great Filipino patriot, a man whose record was above reproach? I am sorry to say we threw our influence behind a gentleman by the name of Roxas, an evil opportunist who collaborated with the Japanese. Of course, that is not surprising, in view of the fact that we are supporting Hitler's henchmen in Greece.

So, the Filipinos were free; but some of them did not like this arrangement. Some of them, the common people, the same type of people that composed Washington's army in the main, decided to fight Roxas. They wanted real freedom. They wanted to break up the great estates, so the little people could have land. They wanted a loyal Filipino for their President, and not a Japanese collaborator. These little people were called the Hukbalahaps. They are the same patriots who sneaked from the jungle to give aid and comfort to our boys on the long march from Bataan. They are the same little people who carried our downed flyers out of the jungles, over tortuous mountain trails, on stretchers. They are the same people who carried on guerrilla warfare against the Japanese—shoulder to shoulder, side by side with our own boys who succeeded in escaping or eluding the Japs.

What has happened to these Filipinos, equivalents of our patriots at Valley Forge? Roxas is using our machine guns to hunt them down and destroy them.

What justification does Jap collaborator Roxas put forward for his slaughter of these people? Mr. President, he is using the same excuse that Hitler used to torture and cremate people, the same pretext that is being used here in America to silence opposition to this present betrayal of the American people to the

monopolist crowd. Roxas says that anybody who opposes him is a Red. In yesterday's newspapers he admitted he had no proof that they were Communists, but that they were saying they were determined to resist until Russia should one day rescue them.

I am afraid, Mr. President, that by our actions in aiding Fascist-type rulers of colonial peoples we are fast losing, perhaps have lost, the high place we once occupied as the champion of the oppressed, the haven of the downtrodden.

We have handed this priceless asset to the Russians. The good will of the little people is a power greater than dollars or guns or even atom bombs in any war, Mr. President, any war, cold or hot.

When I made these statements about the Philippines at the University of Arizona, at Tucson, someone applauded vigorously and I thought, "Who is so interested in the Philippines here in Arizona?" After the meeting a young Filipino who was a student there came up to me, and, with tears in his eyes, blessed me for telling the truth about what was happening to his people. No, Mr. President; I am afraid the Filipinos might not help us if we get into a war with Russia. We would probably have another government in exile on our hands to add to the gala collection we are accumulating here in Washington.

JAPAN

Now, what is going on in Japan? Those people were terribly oppressed, and we were going to free them, we were going to destroy the Zaibatsu, the few big families that had a tight cartel control of Japanese industry. From all I can find out, things have not changed much in Japan. We have made some half-hearted efforts, but even those feeble attempts have been severely criticized on the floor of the Senate. Now we have set out to rebuild Japan as a great military power to help us against Russia. Maybe it will work, but I would not count too heavily upon the support of the Japanese people in the event of war against Russia.

KOREA

Let us go to Korea. From all I can find out, the common people in the Russian zone are faring much better and are more contented than their brothers in the southern zone, which we are occupying. I am sorry to say that, but that is what I hear.

We have left the power in the hands of the same reactionary exploiters who held the people in bondage during the long years of Japanese rule. We are sitting on a powder keg over there by force of arms. Of course, we do not need to worry much about them. They would not amount to much in a war with Russia. Twenty million downtrodden people—a bagatelle!

CHINA

What have we done in China? There is Chiang Kai-shek, whose most ardent friends affectionately call him a "benevolent dictator." It seems that in their eyes a dictator can be benevolent or a tyrant, depending which side of the fence he may be on at the moment. From people who have been there, from

books I have read—yes, and even from reading the press—I am convinced that Chiang is one of the most ruthless tyrants the world has ever known, corrupt, greedy, brutal, and without an ounce of patriotism insofar as seeking the welfare of the people of China is concerned.

I am also convinced that the so-called Communists of China are rather mild Socialists with a program of agrarian reform; that they make a sincere effort at honest government in the areas they hold, and that they have the confidence of the Chinese people. Secretary Marshall and others have repeatedly stated, up until very recently at least, that they have received no appreciable direct aid from Russia. It is a civil war, and it has been going on for almost 20 years, with not even time out for the big war. Nevertheless, we gave Chiang Kai-shek billions of dollars in cash and in the form of armaments. However, his regime is so corrupt, the people have so little confidence in Chiang and the robber barons who surround him, that they will not support the war effort, and his soldiers do as little fighting as they possibly can. Chiang's outfit is so corrupt they even sell to the Communists the armaments we provide them. We made the so-called Communists angry with us because we helped Chiang; now we have made Chiang angry because we quit helping him, so all the Chinese are mad at us. Chiang is threatening to go over to Russia if we do not give him more help, which only goes to prove that you cannot buy friends, and after you think you have bought them they will not stay bought.

The Chinese mess is one of the most unworthy adventures upon which this Nation has ever embarked. By the aid we have given Chiang Kai-shek we have betrayed every principle in which we profess to believe. I shall have more to say about China at some length when our Republican friends bring forth their contribution to the great give-away in the form of aid to China.

I am sorry to say it, Mr. President, but I do not believe that even the Chinese under Chiang Kai-shek have any reason to love us after the misery and suffering we have been so largely instrumental in inflicting upon them. I am convinced they would see us rot before they would raise a hand to help us in any conflict, no matter who our enemy might be. Every day there are reports in the press of riots by students, of demonstrations against the United States all over China.

INDOCHINA

Let us go on down to Indochina. Its good people also shared with us the greatest of all virtues, the love of freedom. They have been exploited by the French since 1870. When the Japs chased the Frenchmen out, they continued the exploitation of the hapless Indochinese, but when the Japs were finally defeated, the Indochinese thought they were at last free. The Japs were done and surely the Frenchmen could not come back after what Adolf Hitler had done to them, so the Indochinese set

up a government and started in business for themselves. But the Frenchmen did come back and they had plenty of guns, ammunition, and all kinds of modern war equipment. Where did they get them? Captured from Adolf Hitler's defeated legions? I wish that were true, Mr. President, but it is not. The French had American guns, and they are using those guns mercilessly to annihilate all opposition and to reenslave the Indochinese. Do you think, Mr. President, those people would help us in a war with Russia? Any person who knows anything at all about human emotions does not need an answer to that question.

INDONESIA

Let us go across the water to Indonesia, a group of islands containing several million energetic, intelligent, and, worse luck again, liberty-loving people. After countless years of enslavement at the hands of clever Dutch exploiters, these people also thought they were free when the Japs gave up the ghost.

However, the Dutch reappeared on the scene and, after considerable fighting, they decided the Indonesians were too much for them, slapped them on the back, figuratively speaking, and said, "You are good fellows. You licked us fair and square. We are going home now. More power to you and good luck with your new-found freedom."

The Indonesians were very happy.

However, their happiness was short-lived.

The Dutchmen came back. They came back with the blitzkrieg technique. They had Patton's tactics and Patton's armaments which we had provided them. They went through the poor Indonesians like a hot knife through butter.

After they had the situation well in hand, we decided to let the United Nations step in, which resulted in the freedom of the Indonesians being severely circumscribed, and the Dutch once more are firmly ensconced in Indonesia.

I cannot bring myself to believe that those people would be very enthusiastic about helping us in any war.

INDIA

What about India?

We have never done anything to them.

Of course, we all remember that when they were having their terrible communal riots not so long ago the newspapers carried headlines saying that our businessmen were all set to flee the country by airplane.

The press told the reason why, also.

It seems that the representatives of our big business were in the habit of living lavishly—luxurious quarters, retinues of Hindu servants.

They lived like rajahs, while out in the streets men, women, and children in untold numbers quietly laid down to die of starvation.

So, to say the least, the Hindus do not love us.

They are not much as fighters, anyhow—they never get enough to eat.

They might not help the Russians, but they would not be much of an obstacle if the Russians set out for the Indian Ocean.

We can pass up Africa.

Everything is not so happy and harmonious there as it might be, but we are not too deeply involved, and the war potential of the Dark Continent is not much to brag about.

ARABIA

We now come to Arabia.

The situation there is one of the blackest in all our involvements.

OIL

There is a large quantity of oil in Arabia, and we have it.

Of course, when I say "we," I do not mean us; I mean Standard and Texaco.

Our oil companies have working agreements with old Ibn-Saud to exploit the oil in Arabia.

They pay him a nominal sum in the way of royalties.

I think I read somewhere that it amounted to two-hundred-and-seventy-odd-million dollars for a 2-year period.

Of course, that is not much, considering what the boys are getting, but it is a lot for old Ibn-Saud.

He does not have to divide up with anyone.

He is an absolute monarch and runs the show all by himself.

But he is nobody's fool, Mr. President.

In addition to his oil royalties, he insists on a little extra help from the United States Government, or he will not play ball with the oil companies.

In other words, the taxpayers of America have to "cough up" additional millions to get him in the right humor to play ball with the oil companies.

Old Ibn-Saud wanted the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to furnish the money to build him a railroad.

He did not have a railroad—not one. He had never ridden on a train and he wanted to see what it was like.

Our boys told him that "railroads are awfully expensive so we would be glad to build you a little railroad around your palace grounds to joy-ride on." If he really wanted roads that went some place, why not highways? They are much cheaper.

But Ibn-Saud was adamant. He wanted a railroad and nothing else would do.

So the Export-Import Bank "coughed up" \$50,000 of the taxpayers hard-earned cash as a starter to survey a railroad for Ibn-Saud.

But really, Mr. President, he did have an excellent reason for wanting a railroad.

He has a summer place in the mountains and a winter place on the coast. He has a harem at each place, and Ibn is old and time is fleeting.

He wanted the railroad so he could get back and forth from one harem to the other without any delay.

May Allah bless old Ibn-Saud.

PALESTINE

Palestine is nearby. Perhaps it would be best if we did not mention Palestine but it is really quite important, Mr. President. It is not because of the numbers of people involved.

There are not so very many Jews in Palestine.

But Palestine has become a symbol to the world, a symbol of the lack of sin-

cerity on the part of America's bipartisan foreign policy moguls—proof positive that they do not have and never did have a genuine interest in the fate of the United Nations.

Our country was a party to the United Nations agreement calling for the partition of Palestine.

Of course, our politicians did not take into account what might be the consequences of a decision to partition Palestine.

They had their eyes on the more immediate goal of trying to win the Jewish vote in America, so they blindly voted for partition.

That pulled the cork out of the magic bottle, and the Arabian genii rose up and towered above the politicians and frightened them with dire threats of what they would do to their oil if they did not call off this Palestine partition.

It seems, Mr. President, that there is nothing that rends the soul of a politician so sadly as to be faced with a choice of choosing between oil and votes, because the oil boys furnish the grease which oils the wheels of political campaigns, but if you play ball with them you are liable to lose the Jewish vote.

A terrible dilemma, is it not, Mr. President?

It is something Pendergast never foresaw and therefore failed to give advice to cover the situation.

The bipartisan boys on the Republican side are also in the same fix.

To further confuse the situation, a Wall Street banker is in charge of the armed services, and he says the armed services must have the oil.

What to do—oil or votes?

But regardless of what eventually may happen, it is plain for everyone to see that the bipartisan politicians do not and never did care anything about the United Nations.

Oil is all mixed up in the Marshall plan, too, Mr. President.

We wish to wean the Europeans away from coal, of which they have plenty, and start them on a diet of oil.

Of course, when they once get to using oil it will be difficult to convert back to coal, and our boys have the oil there in the Middle East.

None of it comes to this country to be sure. But with a little help from the Marshall plan—just a few hundred million dollars, or maybe a billion dollars, or two or three—they can build up markets for the Middle East oil in Europe.

Of course, this argument that we must have the oil never did hold water, because if we should get into this much-talked-about war with Russia it would not take them long to overrun the Middle East and its oil fields.

It does cost the American taxpayers several billion dollars a year to defend the holdings of our oily boys over there, but then they make a lot of profits and we must help American business.

The funny part of this whole business, Mr. President, is that we do not need that oil. Processes have been developed to extract oil from coal. After the oil is extracted the coal is just as good and better than it ever was; it is smokeless.

The coal should be sold for enough to pay for the oil operation and we would practically have the oil for nothing.

There is enough coal in my State of Idaho to furnish our petroleum needs into the unforeseeable future.

But we cannot develop those resources, Mr. President, because the oil companies have not got all the patents corralled yet and they do not want to develop something where strangers might muscle in.

I might say that the new administration that will take over next January will develop these domestic oil resources and not for the benefit of the big oil companies as has been suggested, but for the benefit of the American people.

Right at this moment I do not believe the Arabians love us, and I have heard that the Jews are not too happy with our double dealing, either.

ITALY

Now let us skip Greece and Turkey.

I shall come back to them later.

Let us go to Italy.

How are we getting along there?

It is the same old story—trying to support the government of our choice with dollars, loud talk, and a show of military strength, or, more accurately, naval strength.

Recently the De Gasperi government had to ask us, would we please, pretty please, get all those battleships out of Italian ports, just until after the election, because the Italian people had a little pride. They liked to kid themselves that they were running their own affairs and our battleships, cluttering up their harbors, might jeopardize the chances of our boys in the coming election.

O Mr. President, how the atomic bomb has gone to our head.

The atomic bomb and this new idea that has infected even our dear Republican friends, that we can spend billions and billions any place and every place forever and ever, I guess, to fight communism.

SPAIN

We do not have to worry about Spain. Franco will be on our side. He likes the way this bipartisan gang is running things, and the hints are getting stronger in the press every day, Mr. President, that we will soon be helping dear, old Franco. We helped him once before by refusing aid to the legally constituted Republican Government of Spain. Of course, that was when fascism went out of style for a few years. However, it seems as if the new look in international affairs is to have a distinct Fascist flare.

FRANCE

We are having some trouble in France. It seems that every measure the Government undertakes is designed to increase the hardships of the workers. The workers of France are in a terrible condition, and they had some bad strikes last winter. From what I read in the papers, Communists led all those strikes.

If one believed everything he read in the papers, Mr. President, he would think the Communists were the only people on earth who were interested in the welfare of the workers at all. I do not believe everything I read in the papers.

All the Communists I know I could probably count on one hand, but I know

literally thousands of Americans who are genuinely interested in the welfare of the little people—the workers.

If the press does not quit giving credit to the Communists for every measure in behalf of the common people—price control, rent control, the demand for housing legislation, the fight for a sensible foreign policy, the people will begin to believe there is something in communism.

In Idaho recently the City Council of Twin Falls, in a county which has been Republican since before the beginning of time, passed an ordinance raising the percentage of the "take" from the slot-machine operators. I saw a big headline in the newspaper stating that the slot-machine operators said the councilmen were all Communists. I repeat, if the press does not quit giving credit to the Communists for being the only fighters for these measures, the people are going to begin to believe it one of these days and then we might get communism.

But I am getting away from France. They devaluated their currency recently and threw a monkey wrench into the international monetary agreements. If the Russians had done a thing like that, it would have been good for headlines for at least a week.

In fact, the Russians did devalue their rubles, but they were not in on the international monetary agreements so it was really nobody's business, but I remember now it was good for headlines for 2 weeks. But we passed over the French episode without much notice because our friends are in power in France at the moment—even though the Frenchmen broke their word by their action.

From what I read in the papers it seems we are having quite an argument with the French at the present time because we want to build up Germany and they do not want Germany built up. But they will come around to our way of thinking.

They have got their arm in the Marshall grab bag and we have got the draw string pulled tight and will not let them get their hand-out until they promise to be good and let us build up their old friend, Germany.

I do not know what the Frenchmen would do if there were another war.

They would probably have a war of their own right at home and not join in the main bout.

GERMANY

Now we come to Germany.

I shall not stay on that subject too long because I expect to make a speech about it in a few days.

Suffice to say that we are doing exactly what we did after World War I—instead of dismantling any large number of German plants and turning them over to the people they devastated, we are breaking our word and going to leave them in Germany where our cartel boys can build them up with the help of their old friends who so recently were helping Adolf.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say to the Senator from Idaho that I have

been in attendance on the session of the Senate all afternoon.

Mr. TAYLOR. I appreciate that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have carefully followed the Senator's speech with the exception of periods of a few brief moments when I was called from the floor on a few occasions. Aside from those periods I have been present on the floor of the Senate all afternoon. As I have listened to the Senator from Idaho, the sum total of his speech up to the moment has been that he is critical of the United States Government, he is critical of the United States foreign policies, he is critical of the American economic system, and he has been critical of the American press.

Mr. TAYLOR. In what way?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me finish. He has been critical of the United States military leaders and authorities who led our Nation to the successful conclusion of the war.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have not been critical of them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. He has been critical of the American Nation and America's Allies. I was wondering if any place in his speech he is going to be critical of the Soviet government for the attempts they have made to subject neighboring peoples, to put them behind the iron curtain, to take away their liberties, to execute their democratic leaders. I wonder if any place in the Senator's speech he is going to be critical of them, and not entirely of the Government of the United States?

Mr. TAYLOR. I may say, Mr. President, that the Senator from California did not truly represent what I have said. I have not criticized our military authorities. I gave the generals full credit for winning great victories. I said the GI's had helped them some, but I gave the generals most of the credit. I was not critical of our American system at any point in anything I have said. The Senator from California has misrepresented absolutely.

So far as my pointing out what is the matter with Soviet Russia, Mr. President, I can only say, that there are at least 90 Senators in the United States Senate who every day, several times a day, many times, tell us what is the matter with the Soviet Union and the things they have done. The press is ready to tell us what is the matter with the Soviet Union, and frequently tells us things that are not true respecting what is the matter with the Soviet Union. Because I do not want this world destroyed by atom bombs and bacteriological warfare I am trying to point out that the Russians are not all bad; that they have some good in them. There may still be hope to reach a rapprochement with them. That is what I am trying to do, Mr. President. I do not need to criticize them. I shall leave that for the Senator from California and others who are happy to receive the plaudits of the press by criticizing Russia. I shall try to point out that there are two sides to this matter, and I will take the consequences, but I will not take them lying down. I will fight back every time my position is misrepresented, as it was misrepresented by the Senator from California and by

the distinguished senior Senator from the State of Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Of course, I will bet our boys have a controlling interest this time.

The Germans made a mistake by teaching our businessmen all the ins and outs of cartel manipulation.

Our boys are pretty smart when they once catch on.

So we will build up Germany again.

That will prevent the other European nations from ever becoming very prosperous, but we will have quite a war potential there for this party the boys are cooking up for Joe.

Of course, any fool can see that the Russians will take all that over in 24 hours if any trouble starts, but these bipartisan boys are no fools so they cannot see it.

It is said, Mr. President, that experience is the best teacher.

I sometimes doubt that.

We built up Germany once before.

It will be remembered that our big business boys and Churchill's moneyed friends loaned the Germans the money to build up all that great war potential.

Without their help Hitler never could have done the things he did.

Of course, they had an understanding with their cartel buddies that all this would be used against Russia, but "the best laid plans," Mr. President—

So, when Hitler got all his airplanes, cannons, and tanks, and everything ready he climbed into one of those nice, big tanks and raised up the lid to take a last look around, and it dawned on him.

He said, "Why, nobody has any of these tanks, airplanes, and guns but me."

"I will just take care of Joe later."

So he double-crossed our boys, his cartel friends, and, like Corrigan, he headed in the wrong direction.

We had an awful time stopping him, too, but you have to give our cartel boys credit.

I should like to have the Republicans notice that I am giving the cartel boys credit.

They pitched right in and helped us whip their old pal. Well, maybe they did not pitch right in.

They stalled a little.

We had to give them cost-plus and agree to build their factories for them and a few little things like that.

If there is anything those cartel boys do not like, it is nazism or fascism.

That is, of course, when it is the other fellow's fascism.

They would not mind having some here at home if they could run the thing.

In fact, I think home-grown fascism is the biggest danger to America right now.

But, anyhow, we are building up Germany again and it probably will all be used against us again.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield to my friend from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Idaho has suggested that America is building up Germany. I wonder if the Senator would give us his idea of what we should do as an American nation within Germany.

Mr. TAYLOR. We should leave Germany just the minimum necessary to let her people have a decent standard of living, but not a standard of living as good as their neighbors whom they devastated—whom they have ruthlessly destroyed twice in 25 years. Just leave them a decent standard of living, and remove the excess plants to the neighboring countries—the ones they have overrun and devastated.

Mr. CAIN. I wonder if that means that the Senator thinks the so-called Morgenthau plan should prevail in Germany, which as I understand was simply a declaration that an industrial nation should become for all time a rural and agricultural nation, where peoples were to live on the soil, and have no other means of livelihood?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad to correct the misrepresentation under which the Senator from Washington is laboring. I am not and never have been an advocate of the Morgenthau plan. That is one thing; and leaving Germany a minimum of industrial equipment to have a decent way of life is another.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to ask the Senator one further question. Does he believe it is possible to bring about economic reconstruction and adequacy in western Europe without reconstructing Germany economically?

Mr. TAYLOR. I think it might be done. It might be more expensive, but I think it would be cheap in the long run to move those plants out of Germany, leaving the Germans no more than they absolutely need. I would rather put the money into such a program now and save us trouble in the future. We certainly should have learned by now, although, as I have said, I doubt if experience is the best teacher. It does not seem to work. We seem bent on doing the same thing over again.

Mr. President, I have come to England in this trip around the world to see how our foreign policy is working out. I cannot for the life of me understand why my friends are critical of me because I point out that our foreign policy has lost for us practically all our friends all over the world. If I wanted to fight Russia, as so many others seem to want to do, if I were all-out for fighting Russia, I would probably be more against our foreign policy than I am now, because if I wanted to fight Russia I would want us to have friends; and we have lost practically all of them.

ENGLAND

Now England ought to be our friend. She would surely help us in a war against Russia.

We speak the same language and we fought together twice—but I do not know.

I saw in the newspapers last week that the British had spent the last of the loan we gave them.

It is all gone.

Do you remember when that question was before the Senate, Mr. President?

I was against it.

I said, "Let us not loan the British this money because when you loan people something generally you make enemies out of them."

"They cannot repay it."

"There is no hope of them ever repaying it."

I further said:

"Now they are pretty good people. They put up a great scrap against Hitler."

"They held the fort until we were ready and they took a lot of punishment."

"I think they have earned this three billion seven hundred and fifty million that they are asking for, so let us just give it to them."

"Let us give it to them and forget it."

But, no. All the smart businessmen in the Senate said people do not appreciate anything if we give it to them. They said:

"Make them pay it back."

"Make them pay interest."

Of course, that is where I am at a disadvantage, Mr. President.

I have never made a business of loaning money and I have never collected any interest from anybody.

But did that loan make the British love us?

Mr. President, almost any day one can read in the newspapers that some Briton called us Uncle Shylock or the Yankee Imperialists.

Not only the labor people, Mr. President, but Churchill's boys say things like that about us, too.

I do not know whether the British would be with us in another war or not.

I suppose they would try desperately to keep out of it because they know what would happen to them in this atomic age on their tight little isle.

They would be more of a liability than an asset in such a war, anyway.

SOUTH AMERICA

How about South America, our sister republic to the south?

It will be remembered that we negotiated a mutual-assistance treaty with those good people last year.

It provides that if anybody attacked any one of us, all the rest would pitch in and help.

Of course, Peron introduced a substitute resolution that said that in case anybody was attacked we would all consult each other.

That would be a big help, would it not? There is nothing like consulting one another if someone attacks us.

Peron was a little ahead of his time with this consulting business.

That idea has just now come into its own in connection with the Palestine situation, so maybe he did not have such a bad idea after all. Perhaps Peron was not so far off base.

But we voted him down—by a narrow margin.

We got him to promise to render mutual assistance.

However, the day they signed up, I read in the newspaper that our embassy in Bogota, Colombia, was stoned; and quite regularly one can read in the newspapers that some South American dictator or even some President that we have recently helped elect has called us the "Colossus of the North" or the "Yankee Exploiters."

It is hardly surprising that they do not like us, Mr. President, when we consider how our businessmen behave down there.

They act as if they owned our Government. There might be some argument on that point, but we will not go into it.

They had some trouble with Communists down in Chile awhile back. They cracked their heads, locked some of them up in a mine, and let them starve for a few days.

The President of Chile wanted to outlaw the Communist Party, as some of our 100-percent red-blooded patriots want to do up here.

So let me read what went on down there.

This is from that great liberal publication, *Time*; liberal with abuse for Henry and me; which says:

But not all Chileans wanted to be as tough as their volatile President.

The Socialists, in Chile no friends of Communists, opposed outlawing the party, as a blow to civil liberties.

Pink-cheeked old Senate President Arturo Alessandri, a Liberal, twice Chile's President and still a great power in politics, let it be known that he was against the idea.

Besides, it might not be necessary.

According to Santiago gossip, Gonzales' anti-Communist action had already won the promise of a badly needed \$40,000,000 World Bank loan.

Gonzalez is the President.

Ah, Mr. President, who would not hunt Communists for \$40,000,000? The business of hunting Communists has become the biggest business in the world. It is profitable for everyone except us. We are the suckers.

Continuing with what *Time* magazine has to say about our industrialists:

Visiting United States industrialists—

Mind you, Mr. President, this does not refer to visiting diplomats, but visiting United States industrialists. They talked to the President and told him where to head in.

Visiting United States industrialists, who have told Gonzalez that they would be interested in investing in Chile if ever he got the best of his Commies, could watch the rapid climb of Chile's stock market last week and draw their own conclusions.

Lota coal shares were up 10 points in 5 days.

Our businessmen are a big help.

They go around telling those cheap little 10-cent South American boys where to head in.

I am not convinced, Mr. President, that our sister republics to the south would have any great enthusiasm—that is, the people—for any part of a war against Russia.

CANADA

Now, of course, we come to Canada.

We just take Canada for granted.

We have Canada in our vest pocket, so to speak.

She is so closely tied to us economically and in other ways that anybody would think that she would have to go along with us in almost anything we undertake.

There is another article from *Time* which casts a little doubt on the question of whether the Canadians love us or not. This little article starts out in the typical *Time* fashion.

It is about a Canadian criticizing the United States. It says:

The man who leveled this blast was no third-rater.

Gregarious, graying Leslie Roberts, 51, a long-time newsman, was executive assistant to Canada's Minister of National Defense in the early years of the war, later a war correspondent.

I shall skip most of the article, and get right down to the meat of what "gregarious, graying Leslie" had to say:

Canada is caught in the pincers of America's new power.

Down to here you have not shown aptitude to use it with wisdom, consideration or humility. * * *

You move in on people, not just people in Europe, but on your own good neighbors, militarily, economically, and, by indirection, politically. * * *

You can't run other people's lives, Uncle. * * *

We simply do not enjoy being pushed around. * * *

Your technique is terrible.

So it seems, Mr. President, that the Canadians are not altogether pleased with us. They would probably be forced to help us in a war against Russia, but I doubt if their heart would be in it 100 percent.

So if we intend to fight the Russians, it would seem that we have made a kind of botch of winning friends and influencing people around the world. We had better make up our minds that we are going to have to do the job alone, and quit dissipating our resources all over the globe, and start digging holes in the mountains here at home.

A PEACEFUL POLICY

On the other hand, suppose we wanted to take the other road—the sensible road of continuing and building up the friendly relations with Russia bequeathed to us by Franklin D. Roosevelt. That is what we should have done if we want peace in the world.

But what did we do? We got angry because Stalin and Churchill agreed on spheres of influence and started carving things up. We did not get angry with Winnie, just Joe. So how did we show our displeasure? As I pointed out previously, our press and generals could not even wait for the war to end to start warning us of the terrible menace of Red Russia. The hate campaign of misrepresentation and exaggeration and sensation has gone on endlessly ever since.

HATRED IN THE PRESS

Mr. President, at the beginning of my talk I cited some examples of the hate campaign against Russia that goes on in the press.

Here is another that is typical, and I should like to call it to the attention of the Senate. It is an article in the *Washington Post* for Tuesday, January 22, 1948. The *Post* is probably the most calm, cool, and collected newspaper in Washington; so if it will do a thing like this, there is no doubt its competitors will spread it on even thicker. But this is bad enough, Mr. President.

As I say, this is an example of the drive toward war being conducted by the American press. It is a very wicked thing. It is morally criminal, although not legally punishable. These lords of the press are making the end of the world almost certain with their misrepresentation and inflammatory treatment of news that is none too good at best.

But here it is, Mr. President. Here is an article, two columns wide and about 10 inches deep—20 column inches, appearing in the *Washington Post*. It has a bold headline on it, as you Senators can see, and it says:

Tito sees war soon, paper says.

The subhead is:

Maybe in weeks. Boasts of weapon deadlier than atom bomb.

Then follows an account of a long harangue Tito is supposed to have delivered threatening to sink our Mediterranean fleet and to do all sorts of terrible things to us. But well down in the article, further down than most readers would care to pursue the matter, is this enlightening statement:

Pierre G. S. Dumas, assistant editor of the pro-De Gaulle newspaper, *Dissidence* 40, which published the same purported speech on December 15, said today, however, that he was convinced the report was a fabrication.

Dumas said the story was first printed in good faith.

Since then, he added, he had received reports from Balkan correspondents which convinced him despite his anti-Communist feelings that the alleged speech was never made.

Mr. President, it is almost unbelievable that the American press would do things like this to endanger the peace of the world. They knew the article was false when they printed it, and yet they gave it prominent headlines and wrote it up as fact, with the exception of that buried acknowledgement that it is pure fabrication.

Having seen things like this happen before, I searched the newspaper carefully the next day to see if there would be any further correction or any denial by Tito. Sure enough, there it was—this little article here, about three column inches buried away over next to Dick Tracy, some place. Here is what it said, Mr. President:

European newspaper reports quoting Marshall Tito as saying Yugoslavia was going to use her own atomic bomb and sink the Anglo-American Mediterranean fleets were dismissed by Tito's ambassador yesterday as "fabricated and utterly absurd."

Yugoslavia Envoy Sava N. Kosanovic said Tito had never made such statements, as claimed by some European papers.

"They constitute a malicious provocation, aimed not only at harming Yugoslavia but at poisoning the atmosphere and at hampering the efforts of all those who are working for a better understanding among nations," Kosanovic declared.

Mr. President, if these newspaper people realized what another war will mean—the scientists tell us it will mean the end of the world, literally—you would imagine the newspapers would never have printed a thing like that, knowing it to be a lie. But if it had been a mistake, then you would think they would have printed this denial by Tito with a big headline on it, to reassure the people that this warlike speech had never been made. You would imagine that they would have humbly apologized for printing an erroneous report in the first place, and would have fired the man who was responsible for having it printed.

Instead of that, Mr. President, the press slips a dagger, dipped in the poison of hatred, suspicion, and misunderstanding,

into the heart of a distraught American people, and each day continue to twist it with sadistic malevolence.

If this thing goes on, Mr. President, and war eventually comes, and if there is anyone left to write history, I cannot see anything for the historian to write except that the American press in the period just before the last great war that destroyed civilization was the most irresponsible and powerful criminal that ever existed, not even barring Adolf Hitler, and that it was due to the machinations of this monster that disguised itself as a free press more than any other factor that twenty-century civilization came to its catastrophic end. Lately I have seen a few signs that this mad-dog complex is wearing itself out. Recently the New York Herald Tribune published a series of articles on Russia by John Steinbeck, which sought to give a fair picture of the Russians as people—human beings like ourselves. The Saturday Evening Post had a series of objective articles by Edgar Snow. Recently the Ladies Home Journal had a splendid article, beautifully illustrated, showing how the Russians live, that they are not monsters, but every-day people very similar in many respects to our own fine American stock. I hope this is indicative of a reversal in trend.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one or two questions?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to my good friend.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator feel that there is a prospect of his concluding tonight, if the Senate is kept in session?

Mr. TAYLOR. If the Senate is kept in session, I will conclude.

Mr. WHERRY. I am consulting the Senator's wishes in the matter.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am perfectly willing to quit at any time, unless it is customary to run late in this manner.

Mr. WHERRY. No. My thought was it is past 6:30 and I hoped that possibly by remaining in session, even until now, the distinguished Senator could conclude his speech without breaking it up. I am asking the Senator if he can conclude tonight, or how nearly through he is, in order that I may propound a unanimous-consent request that the Senator be recognized tomorrow in the event he cannot conclude tonight. But if it is the Senator's wish that he be permitted to conclude tonight, I shall be glad to remain and keep the Senate in session until that can be accomplished.

Mr. TAYLOR. No. I should appreciate the opportunity of going over until tomorrow. I shall require at least another hour.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield, then, for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, could the Senator tell me now, so that I may plan for tomorrow, how much further time he will take? Of course, I understand the Senator can retain the floor as long as he wishes. Would the Senator say he is halfway through, or give some indication of that kind?

Mr. TAYLOR. I have another hour, but less than 2 hours, I guarantee.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to cooperate with the Senator, and if he will permit,

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate recesses tonight it may be understood that the senior Senator from Idaho shall be recognized when the Senate convenes tomorrow.

Mr. TAYLOR. I may say—

Mr. WHERRY. Let us get the request put.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall now be glad to yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I may say to the Senator—at the moment I do not recall the Senator's State.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Nebraska. Mr. WHERRY. That is in the middle of the United States. It is a great State, I may say to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, I know it is. It is really the hub of things in that area. My wife is sitting in the balcony, but she has been here before and she heard the Senator from Nebraska help me out on some occasion—I have forgotten just when it was. I was being hard pressed, when the Senator came to my rescue.

Mr. WHERRY. I can tell the Senator when it was, if he wishes to know. It was one night when he was speaking on the Taft-Hartley bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. Very well. At any rate, Mrs. Taylor thinks the Senator from Nebraska is very fine. I do not know whether it is the good looks of the Senator from Nebraska, or his good deeds, but I am sure after this she will entertain an even higher opinion of the Senator. In fact, I do not think I shall allow her to visit the Senate any more.

Mr. WHERRY. It is nice to know that the sentiments of the senior Senator from Idaho concerning the Senator from Nebraska are shared by the better seven-eighths of his family.

The order is, then, by unanimous consent, that when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow, the distinguished Senator from Idaho may continue his speech. Would the Senator like to continue further this evening, or is it perfectly agreeable to him to have me make a motion to recess?

Mr. TAYLOR. I should be perfectly happy to have an opportunity to go home and get something to eat.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before making the motion, I should like to make a statement. The way the debate is now proceeding, with so many wanting to speak—I have requests now from innumerable Senators who desire to deliver speeches—and with so many amendments pending, I feel that the announcement I made earlier in the session today that we would have a Saturday session, if it met with the approval of the Senate, and also a session on Thursday night and Friday, if it became necessary, should stand. I really feel now that such sessions have become necessary. Of course, it is understood that they will be held if the suggestion meets with the approval of the Senate. If it does, as I am sure it will, because this is such an important piece of legislation, it is hoped that with sessions on Thursday night and on Fri-

day night, and on Saturday, the pending bill can be disposed of by the end of the week. If not, we shall continue into next week.

I now move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 10, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 9 (legislative day of February 2), 1948:

IN THE ARMY

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of Louis Simmons Stickney and 1,270 other officers to be colonels in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 9, 1948, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Louis Simmons Stickney shown on page 1199 and ending with the name of Peter Christian Schroder on page 1213.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

To be first lieutenants

Earl Warren Fletcher
Frank Winston Tippitt
Gordon James Rieger
Earl Barnette Broome, Jr.
Robert Maitland Polz
Gordon Joseph James
Richard Harriman Maeder
Robert Vernon Shirk
Robert Hunter McCleary
Austin Wayne Turner
George Bunyon May
Loren Ray Lester
Herman Stein
Adolph Clarence Fossum
Kenneth Richard Hintz
Melville Jewell MacDonald, Jr.
Gilbert Hermann Foltz
William Raymond Homiller
Fred Olen La Fevers, Jr.

Medical Service Corps

To be first lieutenants

Gordon Falconer Weighton
Jack Alexander Creech

Army Nurse Corps

To be first lieutenants

Dorothy Annette Goeller
Olga W. Gull
Ruth Alice Kegler
Betty Arline Klingensmith
Loraine Helen Droxler
Jean Harriet Donahue
Shirley Mae McCoy
Margery Evelyn Cheers

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN THE ARMY NURSE CORPS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE WOMEN'S MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS IN THE GRADES SPECIFIED

To be captains

Vida L. Buehler	Alene V. Ness
Mary C. Burnham	Helena D. Quinn
Elizabeth S. Carlross	Winifred G. Riley
Mildred S. Carter	Barbara M. Sleddon
Mary L. Gill	Mary E. Stack
Norine O. Ginder	Carol Stange
Frances M. Horr	Ruth G. Strain
Alice T. A. Knox	Ethel M. Thielmann
Katharine Leonard	Helen Tremback
Erna G. Lord	Anita V. Williams
Hilda M. Lovett	

To be first lieutenants

Melba L. Adams
Mary L. Albright
Johanna M. Anderson
Juliet M. D. Anton
Agnes M. Arrington
Elizabeth A. Askegaard
Margaret F. Bagar
Doris L. Bailey
Marjorie L. Baker
Geraldine R. Baldwin
Adele M. Ball
Dorothy E. Baltzo
Wilma R. Barney
C. Barbara Bean
Evelyn M. Bedard
Angela R. Benda
Clara R. Bentley
M. Pauline Bettinger
Loretta M. Bevins
Jean B. Bissonette
Louise F. Bitter
Inez H. Blossman
Martha M. Boger
Ada E. Boone
Thelma K. Bormann
Olive J. Boxa
Ruth E. Breneman
Esther Brians
Gertrude E. Brooks
Marjorie T. Brown
Billie E. Bryson
Martha M. Cameron
Virginia A. Cameron
Margaret H. Cannoles
Helen M. Carbonneau
Virginia L. Carroll
Mary J. Carsey
Constance G. Catalano
Jennie L. Caylor
Hazel C. Chadwick
Christine M. Chesnik
Jeannette E. Churchill
Leota H. Clark
Mary E. Clark
Mary S. Clark
Ethel Claxon
Flora L. Clymer
Belle K. Cohen
Betty L. Colyer
Dora M. Coover
Lena J. Cricco
Patricia L. Crocker
Doris J. Crouser
Doroth M. Cunningham
Florine H. Cutts
Alice B. Davidson
Robertine E. Davies
Elizabeth M. Dean
Dorothy M. DeHart
Elaine H. Dellman
Helen C. Dembeck
Janet L. Demy
Anna T. DeNegri
Maryelle Dodds
Marion M. Donaldson
Madelyn F. Donnelly
Kathryn T. Driscoll
Rita R. Dulisse
Rose J. Dull
Cleo E. Durkee
Colatine Dyas
Julia C. Eastwood
Virginia H. Echerd
Anna M. Evans
Hazel L. Evans
Anna E. Fairley
Mary C. Fanning
Maxine H. Fell
Miriam J. Fickes
Wanda I. Fill
Jane C. Flanagan
Edythe M. Fleck
Dorothea V. Fleischer
Margaret C. Flynn
Evelyn Folmar
Eunice M. Ford
Marguerite W. Foster
Emily K. Fralley
Catherine E. Francis
Miriam E. Fuller

Anna D. Funk
Mildred M. Furlong
Ruth E. Fussell
Gladys L. Fusselman
Margaret L. Gattis
Sara J. Gephart
Phyllis M. Gervais
Elnora L. Geyer
Pattie R. Gibbs
Willie C. Gilliam
Katherine S. Gillies
Sheila M. Gillman
Margaret Gist
Agnes C. Glunt
Joyce Goodwin
Eleanor M. Gorman
Patricia Greenan
Catherine R. Grogan
Emma C. Groh
Mary E. Guerdette
Marjorie A. Haley
Anna D. Harkins
Paulanna R. Harkins
Cleo S. Harrod
Willie E. Hart
Mary E. Hartley
Mary B. Hartman
Lillian E. Haws
Sally C. Hayes
Bernice I. Heath
Margith H. Heide
Marie A. Heine
Dorothy A. Helwig
Evelyn M. Henrich
Alice P. Hill
Katherine J. Hills
Phyllis J. Hocking
Maralee R. Hodgson
Ann E. Hogan
Bernice E. Holsinger
Helen C. Hooverson
Margaret L. Hornberger
Elizabeth R. Horne
Marjorie O. Horton
Lucy E. Houghton
Matilda Howard
Vivian Howell
June L. Hudson
Agnes T. Hulme
Barbara M. Hutchins
Elizabeth J. Ingram
Sallie H. Ingram
Agnes M. Jackson
Florence S. Jacobs
Margaret L. Jacobson
Dorothy E. Jaeger
Johanna H. Jakubaitis
Helen C. Jansen
Alice C. Jeffreys
Lillian Jones
Mildred C. Katich
Mary E. Keefe
Lelia M. Kehoe
Arlene E. Kind
Eleanor A. Klensch
Helen S. Kloss
Gladys N. Knowles
Rita M. Kopp
Ethel R. Kovach
Helen S. Koziol
Bernice H. Kress
Ruth B. Krieser
Ruth A. Kruger
Lucile Krumperman
Blanche F. Kuchar
Katherine R. Kurutz
Helen M. Landis
Anna M. Lanzendorfer
Theresa J. Larivee
Caryl R. Lawrence
Mary Lawrence
Marietta Levy
Minale M. Lindo
Lulu M. Lines
Irene Lionais
Josephine A. Lo Cicero
Esther M. Lockwood
Martha E. Lohman
Agnes B. Lohrmann
Imelda H. Lohrmann

Lela M. Lovelace
Hazel J. Lovett
Etta M. Lowe
Mary S. Lowe
Eddie R. Loyd
Mary E. Lynch
Mary K. Lynch
Patty J. Mann
Angelena I. Mariano
Alice S. Marks
Helen M. Martin
Coletta M. Masterson
Kathryn Maurice
Christine Maxwell
Kathryn J. McCann
Dorothea M. McCarty
Helen A. McCloskey
Mercedes A. McCort
Agnes B. McGann
Eleanor McIntyre
Catharine G. McNiven
Mary V. Menold
Catherine A. Merat
Charlotte M. Meyer
Florence J. Mikowski
Esther M. Miller
Kathleen F. Miller
Mae E. Miller
Anne D. Mitchell
Hannah T. Mohr
Mary A. Moles
Esther J. Moran
Marion M. Morris
Ida B. Morrison
Mary E. Morse
Mary F. Morse
Dorothy H. Murray
Rowella H. Newell
Charlotte L. Nolan
Irene B. Norkus
Walburga G. Nye
Evelyn R. Ordway
Margaret L. Ormand
Naomi I. Osborne
Esta C. Ott
Mary E. Oulmet
Jewell A. Outlaw
Reverdy M. Overbey
Susie W. Page
Margaret T. Paolilli
Joline D. Parente
Alice S. Patterson
Isabel S. Paulson
Irene M. Pawlowski
Mildred M. Peace
Mildred Perkins
Lorraine W. Pertelt
Mabel E. Pierce
Carrie E. Pittman
Alice E. Planty
Mary K. Platt
Audrae A. Quintini
Constance H. Ramsey
Margaret E. Remington
Ellen M. Respini
Bertha D. Richardson
Catherine M. Riney

To be second lieutenants

Frances Aragon
Audrey P. Atkinson
Dorothy R. Bonsall
Gladys I. Breault
Mary M. Breunig
Opal T. Cameron
Erin E. Cannon
Claire D. Cardinal
Anna G. Casey
Olga L. Chernak
Muriel E. Clapper
Helen S. Comac
Catherine N. Cotsones
Theresa E. Daley
Dolores A. Damberger
Grace M. Dickson
Muriel E. Eckelberg
Janice W. Feagin
Rose M. Ferrelli
Mary E. Feters
Enola S. Flowers
Bertha G. Goodfellow
Phyllis A. Hall
Myra J. Hanlon
Katherine Henningsen
Marian Horner
Ethel M. Inglis
Margaret M. Kish
Frances C. Knipe
Marilouise Knott
Marybelle J. Lacey
Amalia R. Lazaro
Ruth M. Leahy
Mabel D. Lewis
Catherine M. Loeffel
Beulalys Masterson
Maxine Miller
Catherine E. Paight
Ruth M. Pray
Bernadette L. Reider
Mildred E. Schapiro
Marie J. Schmahl
Kathryn E. Schultz
Virginia M. Shaffer

Marian F. Sindoni
Roberta W. Smith
Artrude M. Stark
Marilynn C. Stevens
Phyllis R. Strobel
Harriet Ter Borg

Jane M. Valine
Alma E. V. Wallsten
Rosemary Witt
Harriet L. Wood
Donna P. Zimmerman

*IN THE AIR FORCE**PROMOTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE*

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of section 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be first lieutenants

Wilbert Edward Habakangas
Rowland Douglas Smith, Jr.
James Morton Bush
Oscar Wallace Lincoln Brown
Travis Ervin Koch
Hugh Munsey Smith
William Jackson Rand
Darrell Glenn Williamson
Joel Charles Lee
Carl Walters, Jr.
Ray Lorentzen Barry
Robert Leonard Vandiver
Roger Treat Jackson, Jr.
Kenneth Ballard Smith
Hollon Howard Bridges
James Tipton Barnes
Arthur Wallace Augustine, Jr.
Charles Arthur Sherman
Albert Verne Works, Jr.
Edward Robert Brandt
Harry Leroy Bates
Charles Edward Limbird
Thomas Edison Ivey
Robert Ervin Nash, Jr.
Erling Orvin Wehlender
George Elmer Hedge
Maston Adolphus O'Neal, Jr.
Edwin Cole Walker
James Harris Milze
Paul David Lehman
Mark Edward Wilt
Milton Kenneth Kegley
Jack Bonds Robbins
Donald Edward Greer
Wallace Reid Watson
Remer LaVerne Harding
James Carson Taylor
Charles Clancie Yates
Walter Bennett Forbes
Robert Edward Gordon
William Monroe Bomar, Jr.
Felix Asla, Jr.
Robert Meade Ryan, Jr.
Iri Duane Johnson
Giles Anthony Robb, Jr.
Ziba Bennitt Ogden
Myron Belmont Goers
Earl Lewis Suneson
Miles Edsel Taylor
Peter David Summer
George Zane Schroeder
Howard Mac Lane
William Joseph McMahon
Robert William Maloy
Malcolm Albert Stewart
Hawood Estle Kornegay, Jr.
Lawrence Kenneth Ricker
Richard Albert Atkins, Jr.
Stanley Joseph Buinicky
Marshall Rae Duncan
William Doyle Taylor, Jr.
Robert Harry Cline
Lawrence Vincent Bach, Jr.
Robert Edwin Vickers, Jr.
James Francis Ward, Jr.
Rodger Sheridan Elliott
John Patrick Walsh
Charles Evans Beardsley
Herman Arthur Hammel
Louis Rae Harris
Kenneth Ray Van Zandt
William Henry Perkins
Edwin Raymond Kellogg
Robert Newton Fidler
William Cullen Schwitzgebel
Paul Bryan Monroe, Jr.
William Albert Seward, Jr.
Harry Frank Greenhow
Donald Michael Walters

IN THE NAVY
APPOINTMENTS IN THE SUPPLY CORPS OF THE
NAVY, IN THE GRADES INDICATED

Lieutenant commander

Edward C. Sockerson

Lieutenants

William R. May
George S. Rawson

Lieutenant (junior grade)

Howard D. McPike

Ensigns

Alan J. Frankel
Calvin D. Landis
Roger M. Wilsie

To be ensigns in the Navy

Morrison D. Ismond
John D. Shaw

To be ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy

William F. Cecil

*To be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the
Chaplain Corps of the Navy*

Ernst A. Wolfram, Jr.

*To be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the
Navy*

Marguerite Asci	Arlene B. Cressman
Anna M. Belaire	Josephine L. Croftchik
Ruth M. Bowers	Constance R. Esposito
Marian J. Bricker	Alice C. Fogarty
Catherine P. Clarke	Yoshiko Tanigawa
Theresa T. Clarke	

The following-name officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Commander

John J. Brown

Lieutenant commander

William L. Roberts

Lieutenant

Thomas D. Yocum

Lieutenants (junior grade)

Charles E. Boonstra	Thomas W. Stewart
Elbert C. Brinning, Jr.	Louis Sussman
John W. Howard	Richard K. Williams
John H. Liles, Jr.	

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenant

Bernard G. Platt

IN THE MARINE CORPS

APPOINTMENT TO THE MARINE CORPS

*To be a second lieutenant in the Marine
Corps*

James J. Gorman

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 9, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious Lord, Thou who hast brought us to the light of this day, we pray that we may never falter in our devotion to Thee and to our country.

Do Thou send us forth glorying in our material and spiritual blessings; forbid that we should waste them in riotous living or in those follies which are the foretoken of regret, of poverty, and a barren home life. Do Thou keep our people frugal and yet generous in dispensing their good fortune. Grant that the discipline of life, which comes from econ-

omy, from industry and its tasks, may teach us to shun vain delights and to labor zealously for the good of our people and for the restoration of a sane and wise understanding through all this yearning world.

Hear us for the sake of Thy dear Son, Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 408. An act for the relief of Lawson Ashby; Mrs. Ora Ashby; and Lawson Ashby, the legal guardian of Betty Mae Ashby, a minor; Darrel Ashby, a minor; Kenneth Ashby, a minor; and Vernon Ashby, a minor;

H. R. 431. An act for the relief of the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C.;

H. R. 621. An act for the relief of Vera Frances Elicker;

H. R. 697. An act for the relief of Mrs. Essie N. Fannin, Miss Helen Hicks, Miss Marie Hicks, Miss Frances Fannin, William O. Thompson, and Mrs. W. D. Thompson;

H. R. 993. An act for the relief of the estate of Norman C. Cobb, Naomi R. Cobb, and Garland L. Cobb;

H. R. 1131. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim or claims of Charles L. Baker;

H. R. 1139. An act for the relief of Dr. Gisela Perl (Krausz);

H. R. 1152. An act for the relief of Mrs. Inga Patterson, widow of F. X. Patterson;

H. R. 1298. An act for the relief of Anastasios Panage Ioannatos (known as Anastasios Panage Ionnatos or Tom Panage Yanatos);

H. R. 1654. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Elizabeth Campbell;

H. R. 1864. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ralford D. Smith;

H. R. 1929. An act for the relief of Edwin Osgood Cogan, his wife Helen Olga Cogan, and his daughter Isabel Joan Cogan;

H. R. 2012. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pearl Cole;

H. R. 2268. An act for the relief of Charles E. Crook and B. L. Fleider;

H. R. 2293. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate navigation on the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters"; approved February 8, 1895;

H. R. 2373. An act for the relief of Stanley-Yelverton, Inc.;

H. R. 2374. An act for the relief of Nita H. Stanley;

H. R. 3175. An act to add certain public and other lands to the Shasta National Forest, Calif.;

H. R. 3742. An act for the relief of Robert Wilhelm Gerling;

H. R. 3936. An act to authorize the United States Park Police to make arrests within Federal reservations in the environs of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3964. An act for the relief of Thomas D. Sherrard;

H. R. 3973. An act relating to the compensation of commissioners for the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 4331. An act for the relief of Bertha M. Rogers;

H. R. 4541. An act for the relief of Jesse F. Cannon, Jackson Jones, and the estate of John Halstadt;

H. R. 4570. An act for the relief of Howard A. Yeager; and

H. R. 4980. An act relating to the acquisition by the United States of State-owned lands within Glacier National Park, in the State of Montana, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2502. An act to provide for the general welfare and advancement of the Klamath Indians in Oregon; and

H. R. 4838. An act to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 69. An act for the relief of Mrs. Florence Benolken;

S. 148. An act for the relief of Charles G. Meyers;

S. 182. An act for the relief of Sgt. John H. Mott;

S. 188. An act for the relief of Dionisio R. Trevino;

S. 576. An act for the relief of Dan C. Rodgers;

S. 675. An act to provide for the naturalization of Mary Gemma Kawamura;

S. 969. An act for the relief of Damian Arruti;

S. 1046. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jacinta Santos Harn, Dr. Charles S. Harn, Helen Harn, Winifred Mary Harn, and James Harn;

S. 1090. An act to safeguard and consolidate certain areas of exceptional public value within the Superior National Forest, State of Minnesota, and for other purposes;

S. 1142. An act for the relief of Anna Pechnik;

S. 1164. An act for the relief of Doris D. Chrisman;

S. 1263. An act for the relief of Fire District No. 1 of the town of Colchester, Vt.;

S. 1307. An act for the relief of Edward Traylor Rogers;

S. 1312. An act for the relief of Jeanette C. Jones and minor children;

S. 1331. An act for the relief of Frances Ethel Beddington;

S. 1468. An act providing for payment of \$50 to each enrolled member of the Mescalero Apache Indian Tribe from funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States;

S. 1550. An act for the relief of John Clark Sharman;

S. 1588. An act for the relief of E. W. Strong;

S. 1630. An act for the relief of Louis L. Williams, Jr.;

S. 1651. An act to amend the General Bridge Act of 1946;

S. 1654. An act for the relief of John E. Peterson and Guy F. Allen;

S. 1742. An act for the relief of John Frederick Firth-Hand;

S. 1871. An act to restore certain lands to the town site of Wadsworth, Nev.;

S. 1875. An act for the relief of the estate of Francis D. Shoemaker;

S. 1958. An act to provide for the designation of the reservoir formed by the dam on the Grand River near Fort Gibson, Okla., as Lake Chouteau; and

S. 2081. An act to extend the provisions of the Federal Airport Act to the Virgin Islands.

TRANSFER OF OFFICERS BETWEEN THE SERVICES

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.